

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 348--81st Congress

Chapter 674--1st Session

S. J. Res. 53

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 348	1
Index and Summary of History on S. J. Res. 53	1

REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION. Declares the policy of Congress to accelerate and provide a continuing basis for reforestation and revegetation of forest lands. Authorizes, for reforestation through the Forest Service, appropriation of \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1951, \$5,000,000 for 1952, \$7,000,000 for 1953, \$8,000,000 for 1954, \$10,000,000 for 1955 and for each subsequent year through 1965, and such amounts as may be needed thereafter. Authorizes, for revegetation through the Forest Service, appropriation of \$1,500,000 for 1951, \$1,750,000 for 1952, \$2,000,000 for 1953, \$2,500,000 for 1954, \$3,000,000 for 1955 and for each subsequent year through 1965, and such amounts as may be needed thereafter.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON S. J. RES. 53

February 14, 1949	S. J. Res. 53 was introduced by Senator Anderson and was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Print of the resolution as introduced.
February 16, 1949	H. J. Res. 167 was introduced by Rep. Mansfield and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of the resolution as introduced. (Companion measure).
March 8, 1949	Senate Committee reported S. J. Res. 53 without amendment. Senate Report 97. Print of the measure as reported.
April 11, 1949	Senate discussed and passed S. J. Res. 53 as reported.
April 12, 1949	Print of S. J. Res. 53 as referred to the House Committee on Agriculture.
May 13, 1949	Hearings: House, H. J. Res. 167 and S. J. Res. 53.
June 6, 1949	House Committee reported S. J. Res. 53 without amendment. House Report 733. Print of the measure as reported.
September 27, 1949	House Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of S. J. Res. 53. Print of the resolution.
September 29, 1949	House debated and passed S. J. Res. 53 as reported.
October 11, 1949	Approved. Public Law 348.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 53

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 14, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

Whereas the national forests of the United States contain approximately eighty million acres of the Nation's commercial timber lands and approximately eighty-three million acres of the Nation's important grazing lands; and

Whereas these national-forest lands comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries, and good forest and other vegetative cover is essential for watershed protection; and

Whereas these lands annually supply approximately four billion board-feet of forest products through twenty-seven thousand sales transaction and the demand for national forest timber is steadily increasing; and

Whereas these lands are the sole or main source of summer range for ten million cattle and sheep grazed by thirty thousand livestock permittees whose livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon livestock grazed on national-forest ranges; and

Whereas these lands contain over four million acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and an additional four million acres of seriously depleted range lands; and

Whereas all of these lands are potentially capable of producing an important part of the timber and forage needs of local communities, and contributing to the protection of watersheds, thereby alleviating flood damage and insuring a continuing water supply, increasing opportunity for local employment, bringing greater stability to local communities, and increasing returns to counties in the national forests from their share of national forests receipts, together with other benefits; and

Whereas these lands will not restock or revegetate satisfactorily or within a reasonable time except through reforestation and revegetation or other measures to induce restocking or revegetation; and

Whereas it is practical to reforest these denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timber lands and revegetate these seriously depleted range lands in a period of fifteen years; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide reasonable continuity of reforestation and revegetation programs in order to insure effective, efficient, and economical operations: Therefore be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
 2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

1 That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate
2 and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation
3 and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands
4 under administration or control of the Forest Service of the
5 Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits
6 hereinbefore enumerated.

7 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
8 of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other
9 lands under the administration or control of the Forest
10 Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the
11 acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there
12 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available
13 until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000
14 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$5,000,000 for
15 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$7,000,000 for the
16 fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$8,000,000 for the fiscal
17 year ending June 30, 1954; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
18 ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent
19 year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and
20 thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation;
21 and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951;
22 \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952;
23 \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953;
24 \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954;
25 \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a

- 1 like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal
- 2 year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts
- 3 as may be needed for range revegetation.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST Session

S. J. RES. 53

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDERSON

FEBRUARY 14, 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 167

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 16, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

Whereas the national forests of the United States contain approximately eighty million acres of the Nation's commercial timberlands and approximately eighty-three million acres of the Nation's important grazing lands; and

Whereas these national-forest lands comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries, and good forest and other vegetative cover is essential for watershed protection; and

Whereas these lands annually supply approximately four billion board-feet of forest products through twenty-seven thousand sales transactions, and the demand for national forest timber is steadily increasing; and

Whereas these lands are the sole or main source of summer range for ten million cattle and sheep grazed by thirty thousand livestock permittees whose livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon livestock grazed on national-forest ranges; and

Whereas these lands contain over four million acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and an additional four million acres of seriously depleted range lands; and

Whereas all of these lands are potentially capable of producing an important part of the timber and forage needs of local communities, and contributing to the protection of watersheds, thereby alleviating flood damage and insuring a continuing water supply, increasing opportunity for local employment, bringing greater stability to local communities, and increasing returns to counties in the national forests from their share of national-forests receipts, together with other benefits; and

Whereas these lands will not restock or revegetate satisfactorily or within a reasonable time except through reforestation and revegetation or other measures to induce restocking or revegetation; and

Whereas it is practical to reforest these denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and revegetate these seriously depleted range lands in a period of fifteen years; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide reasonable continuity of reforestation and revegetation programs in order to insure effective, efficient, and economical operations: Therefore be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
 2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

1 That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate
2 and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation
3 and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands
4 under administration or control of the Forest Service of the
5 Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits
6 hereinbefore enumerated.

7 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
8 of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other
9 lands under the administration or control of the Forest
10 Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the
11 acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there
12 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available
13 until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000
14 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, \$5,000,000 for
15 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, \$7,000,000 for the
16 fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, \$8,000,000 for the fiscal
17 year ending June 30, 1954, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal
18 year ending June 30, 1955, a like amount for each subse-
19 quent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965,
20 and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforesta-
21 tion; and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
22 1951, \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952,
23 \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953,
24 \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954,
25 \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, a

- 1 like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal
- 2 year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts
- 3 as may be needed for range revegetation.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 167

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MANSFIELD

FEBRUARY 16, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

PROVIDING FOR THE REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION OF THE FOREST AND RANGE LANDS OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS

MARCH 8 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 21), 1949.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. J. Res. 53]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes, having considered same, report thereon with the recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

A copy of a letter dated March 4, 1949, from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles F. Braman, which sets forth in detail its recommendations, is attached hereto and made a part of said report.

MARCH 4, 1949.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Reference is made to the request made today for an immediate report to your committee on Senate Joint Resolution 53, designed to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

As to reforestation:

Out of the approximately 80,000,000 acres of commercial timberlands within the national forests, there are approximately 4,000,000 acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked lands. Reforestation of these lands is required to bring them back into timber production. Present unsatisfactory stocking of these lands has resulted primarily from either forest fires or mistreatment by previous owners before acquisition and addition of them to the national forests.

The Forest Service of this Department has been conducting reforestation operations on the national forests for more than 40 years. Satisfactory and efficient methods for conduct of the work are thoroughly known and tested. A total of 1,270,571 acres have been successfully planted to date on the national forests. Reforestation was one of the major activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps during the 1930's. The highest accomplishment in a single year was in 1936 when 214,306 acres were planted.

2 REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION OF NATIONAL FORESTS

During the war reforestation work was virtually suspended. Currently \$1,326,862 is available for reforestation work on the national forests. Because of high labor rates and costs for rehabilitating nurseries after suspension of activity during the war years, a rate of planting of only around 30,000 acres annually has been achieved in the postwar period.

The Forest Service has studied ways and means to accomplish the reforestation job on the national forests in the cheapest and most efficient manner. An objective has been set up to do the job in a 15-year period. It is essential that the program be carried on without interruption to obtain the lowest cost, since as much as 5 years may be needed for some species between the time of seed collection and the field planting of the resulting nursery-grown stock. There is general agreement that this reforestation work should be done eventually. Postponement or delays in doing this work will result in added expense and further delay of benefits into the distant future.

The 15-year reforestation program recommended by the Forest Service contemplates planting of 2,200,000 acres of nonstocked lands and 1,000,000 acres of those understocked lands which are most critically in need of additional stocking. The total cost of this work, including essential plantation care and release of existing plantations and those to be established, is approximately \$119,000,000, or an average expenditure of \$7,933,333 annually. During the first year of such a program the funds needed would be approximately \$3,000,000 with gradual rising amounts as nurseries are developed and adequate amounts of nursery stock are grown. At about the midpoint of the 15-year period, an expenditure of as much as \$10,000,000 may be advisable to attain maximum efficiency. Toward the end of the 15-year period substantial curtailments in expenditures could be made as the program is completed in certain areas and reductions in expenditures for nursery operations and maintenance become possible.

As to revegetation:

Out of the approximately 83,000,000 acres of land used for grazing in the national forests, about 4,000,000 acres are in a seriously depleted condition. Much of this area is located on important watersheds which have been damaged by past overgrazing. Such lands are not producing anywhere near the amount of forage they should. Moreover, in their present condition, they constitute serious erosion hazards which threaten entire communities. There is immediate and pressing need for an enlarged program designed to check the present downward trend in both soils and vegetation, and to restore the depleted areas to maximum productivity.

Range revegetation work on the national forests has now advanced from experimental to project stages. As in the case of reforestation, effective methods have been developed and tested and are now being applied. Depleted range and watershed areas can be restored to productivity within 2 or 3 years and made to support from 5 to 10 times the number of livestock now carried.

A total of more than 200,000 acres of national forest range land have been successfully reseeded to date. For fiscal year 1949 the budget continued a \$543,000 item for range revegetation. Subsequently this item was increased by \$250,000 on the floor of the House during debate on the 1949 agricultural appropriation bill.

Overgrazed ranges in a good many national forest areas require drastic reductions in livestock use. In some areas decades will be required to restore the vegetation on such areas if nature is left to her own devices. And even then the results would fall far short of what could be accomplished by other means. Such procedure would obviously be insufficient and wasteful. Moreover, it would defeat the very worth-while objective of doing everything practicable to provide additional forage for livestock at a time when the world is in need of all the food that can be produced.

The more constructive approach is one of range and watershed rehabilitation through a planned program of revegetation, along with a somewhat less drastic reduction in livestock numbers. It is recommended that the revegetation job be set up for completion in a 15-year period as provided for in the resolution.

During the first year of this program approximately \$1,500,000 would be needed with progressive increases thereafter as adequate supplies of seed, equipment, and materials are made available. Beginning with the fifth year of the program it is expected that the project would level off to an expenditure of about \$3,000,000 annually until completion of the presently needed program.

Appropriations under authorization of this resolution would remain available until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year (p. 3, lines 12 and 13, of the resolution). Nursery operations are in full swing in late June and early July. Sowing, transplanting, and weeding operations should be scheduled in accordance with

local weather conditions without regard to closure of the fiscal year on June 30. Reforestation work can be done more economically and effectively under this provision of the resolution.

Senate Joint Resolution 53 would establish a policy of Congress and authorize appropriations for a planned reforestation and revegetation program in the national forests. Enactment of the resolution is recommended.

In view of the time limitation we have not obtained advice from the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of this bill to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN, *Secretary*.



Calendar No. 80

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 53

[Report No. 97]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 14, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

MARCH 8 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 21), 1949

Reported by Mr. ANDERSON, without amendment

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

Whereas the national forests of the United States contain approximately eighty million acres of the Nation's commercial timber lands and approximately eighty-three million acres of the Nation's important grazing lands; and

Whereas these national-forest lands comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries, and good forest and other vegetative cover is essential for watershed protection; and

Whereas these lands annually supply approximately four billion board-feet of forest products through twenty-seven thousand sales transactions and the demand for national forest timber is steadily increasing; and

Whereas these lands are the sole or main source of summer range

for ten million cattle and sheep grazed by thirty thousand livestock permittees whose livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon livestock grazed on national-forest ranges; and

Whereas these lands contain over four million acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and an additional four million acres of seriously depleted range lands; and

Whereas all of these lands are potentially capable of producing an important part of the timber and forage needs of local communities, and contributing to the protection of water sheds, thereby alleviating flood damage and insuring a continuing water supply, increasing opportunity for local employment, bringing greater stability to local communities, and increasing returns to counties in the national forests from their share of national forests receipts, together with other benefits; and

Whereas these lands will not restock or revegetate satisfactorily or within a reasonable time except through reforestation and revegetation or other measures to induce restocking or revegetation; and

Whereas it is practical to reforest these denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timber lands and revegetate these seriously depleted range lands in a period of fifteen years; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide reasonable continuity of reforestation and revegetation programs in order to insure effective, efficient, and economical operations: Therefore be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

1 That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate
2 and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation
3 and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands
4 under administration or control of the Forest Service of the
5 Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits
6 hereinbefore enumerated.

7 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
8 of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other
9 lands under the administration or control of the Forest
10 Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the
11 acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there
12 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available
13 until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000
14 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$5,000,000 for
15 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$7,000,000 for the
16 fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$8,000,000 for the fiscal
17 year ending June 30, 1954; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
18 ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent
19 year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and
20 thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation;
21 and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951;
22 \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952;
23 \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953;
24 \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954;
25 \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 53

[Report No. 97]

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDERSON

FEBRUARY 14, 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

MARCH 8 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 21), 1949

Reported without amendment

1 like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal
2 year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts
3 as may be needed for range revegetation.

amended by inserting after section 204 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 204a. (1) All actions at law by common carriers by motor vehicle subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(2) For recovery of overcharges, action at law shall be begun against common carriers by motor vehicle subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (3) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(3) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in paragraph (2) a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to this part begins action under paragraph (1) for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the carrier.

"(4) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the carrier, and not after.

"(5) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for transportation services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(6) The provisions of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this section."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purposes of this section the term 'carrier' means a common carrier by water."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (f) (1) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) (A) All actions at law by carriers subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(B) All complaints against carriers for the recovery of damages not based on overcharges shall be filed with the Commission within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subdivision (D).

"(C) For the recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun or complaint filed with the Commission against carriers subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subdivision (D), except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(D) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in subdivision (B) or the 2-year period of limitation in subdivision (C) a carrier subject to this part begins action under subdivision (A) for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be

extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the carrier."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. Paragraph (5) of subsection (f) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 406 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 406a. (1) All actions at law by freight forwarders subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(2) For recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun against freight forwarders subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (3) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the freight forwarder within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the freight forwarder to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(3) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in paragraph (2) a freight forwarder subject to this part begins action under paragraph (1) for recovery of charges in respect of the same service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the freight forwarder.

"(4) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the freight forwarder, and not after.

"(5) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for service in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(6) The provisions of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 110) to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between col-

leges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 213) to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the bill proposes exactly what the title says, to provide benefits for members of the reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training. It also includes the National Guard.

The thought behind the bill is that we must build up the Reserve if we ever intend to decrease the expense of our Regular Military Establishment. Up to date the young men who are serving in the Reserve, training for periods of less than 30 days, have not been permitted full coverage for disabilities incurred because of accidents or otherwise. It seems to me that they should be given the same consideration as those who are training for periods longer than 30 days.

In short, the bill proposes to give the same disability coverage to reservists and national guardists injured or killed while serving their country in peacetime as the Regulars now enjoy. Under present law they are not accorded the same protection that Regulars receive unless they are on active-duty orders for more than 30 days.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Maine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "perform", to insert "active duty for training or"; in line 13, after the word "compensation", to insert "death gratuity"; and after the word "pay", to strike out "and"; in line 14, after the word "benefits", to insert "and pay and allowances"; and in line 21, to strike out "United States Employees' Compensation Commission", and insert "Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency"; on page 3, in line 2, after the word "re-

ceive". to strike out the colon and the words "Provided further, That this section shall be effective from September 8, 1939"; in line 10, after "United States", to insert "or the Air Force of the United States"; in line 12, after "Army", to insert "or the Regular Air Force"; in line 16, after "days", to strike out "(other than for service with the Civilian Conservation Corps)"; and in line 21, after the word "perform", to insert "active duty for training or"; on page 4, in line 2, after the word "compensation", to insert "death gratuity"; in line 3, after the word "pay", to strike out "and"; and after the word "benefits", to insert "and pay and allowances"; in line 4, after the word "law", to insert "or regulation"; in line 6, after the word "Army", to insert "or the Regular Air Force"; beginning in line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the preceding sections of this act shall take effect as of August 14, 1945. No back pay, pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall be held to have accrued as a result of the enactment of this act prior to the date on which it is enacted.

And insert:

SEC. 3. All officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, the federally recognized National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia—

(1) if engaged for periods in excess of 30 days in any type of training or active duty under sections 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so engaged; or

(2) if engaged for any period of time in any type of training or active duty under such sections of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed, shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be effective from August 14, 1945, but no back pay, pension, compensation, death gratuity, or retirement pay shall be held to have accrued as the result of the enactment of this act for any period prior to such date: *Provided*, That in the case of persons electing to receive the benefits of this act, the amount of any monetary benefits received for any period subsequent to August 14, 1945, under any provisions of law providing benefits for disability or death incident to the service described in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, shall be deducted from the monetary benefits provided for herein.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any benefits to which he was entitled prior to its enactment.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 855c-1), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. All officers, nurses, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the United States Naval Reserve or United States Marine Corps Reserve, who—

(1) if called or ordered into active naval or military service by the Federal Govern-

ment for extended naval or military service in excess of 30 days, suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so employed; or

"(2) if called or ordered by the Federal Government to active naval or military service or to perform active duty for training or inactive-duty training for any period of time, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed;

shall be deemed to have been in the active naval service during such period, and they or their beneficiaries shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps: *Provided*, That a person who is eligible for the benefits prescribed by this act be also eligible for pension under the provisions of the act of June 23, 1937 (50 Stat. 305); compensation from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, under the provisions of section 304 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1181) or retired pay under the provision of section 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1183), he shall elect which benefit he shall receive."

SEC. 2. The last proviso to section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress," approved April 3, 1939, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States, or the Air Force of the United States, other than the officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, or the Regular Air Force who—

"(1) if called or ordered into the active military service by the Federal Government for extended military service in excess of 30 days suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so employed; or

"(2) if called or ordered by the Federal Government to active military service or to perform active duty for training or inactive-duty training for any period of time, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed,

shall be deemed to have been in the active military service during such period and shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force."

SEC. 3. All officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, the federally recognized National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia—

(1) if engaged for periods in excess of 30 days in any type of training or active duty under sections 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so engaged; or

(2) if engaged for any period of time in any type of training or active duty under such sections of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed, shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be effective from August 14, 1945, but no back pay, pension, compensation, death gratuity, or retirement pay shall be held to have accrued as the result of the enactment of this act for any period prior to such date: *Provided*, That in the case of persons electing to receive the benefits of this act, the amount of any monetary benefits received for any period subsequent to August 14, 1945, under any provisions of law providing benefits for disability or death incident to the service described in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, shall be deducted from the monetary benefits provided for herein.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any benefits to which he was entitled prior to its enactment.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this joint resolution follows a series of recommendations by congressional committees and by others in regard to reforestation and replanting of sections of the public range.

Two years ago an investigation was conducted by the Barrett committee of the House of Representatives. It visited a number of the western areas and complained that the stockmen were having their grazing areas reduced, and suggested that that would not be necessary if the Department of Agriculture would undertake a replanting program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables, one showing the acreage of planting in each State, and the other showing the amount of revegetation which is proposed.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Initial planting program¹ on national forest lands by States (as of March 1949)

State	Non-stocked land	Under-stocked land	Total
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Alabama.....	60,000	10,000	70,000
Arizona.....	13,000	—	13,000
Arkansas.....	35,000	5,000	40,000
California.....	314,000	271,000	585,000
Colorado.....	70,000	8,000	78,000
Florida.....	90,000	6,000	96,000
Georgia.....	1,500	—	1,500
Idaho.....	456,000	20,000	476,000
Illinois.....	12,000	2,000	14,000
Indiana.....	10,000	—	10,000
Kentucky.....	10,000	—	10,000
Louisiana.....	10,000	6,000	16,000

¹ Includes both areas to be planted and areas to be seeded to tree species.

Initial planting program on national forest lands by States (as of March 1949)—Con.

State	Non-stocked land	Under-stocked land	Total
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Michigan.....	510,000	180,000	690,000
Minnesota.....	175,000	190,000	365,000
Mississippi.....	155,000	17,000	172,000
Missouri.....	25,000	17,000	42,000
Montana.....	90,000	5,000	95,000
Nebraska.....	9,000	-----	9,000
Nevada.....	15,000	-----	15,000
New Hampshire.....	2,000	-----	2,000
New Mexico.....	115,000	5,000	120,000
North Carolina.....	10,000	5,000	15,000
Ohio.....	10,000	1,000	11,000
Oregon.....	310,000	220,000	530,000
Pennsylvania.....	45,000	6,000	51,000
South Carolina.....	15,000	6,000	21,000
South Dakota.....	30,000	3,000	33,000
Tennessee.....	5,000	-----	5,000
Texas.....	10,000	17,000	27,000
Utah.....	10,000	-----	10,000
Vermont.....	1,000	1,000	2,000
Washington.....	135,000	70,000	205,000
West Virginia.....	12,000	1,000	13,000
Wisconsin.....	165,000	95,000	260,000
Wyoming.....	1,500	-----	1,500
Virginia.....	1,000	6,000	7,000
Total.....	2,938,000	1,173,000	4,111,000

State:	<i>Acres</i>
Arizona.....	100,000
California.....	250,000
Colorado.....	450,000
Idaho.....	526,000
Montana.....	100,000
Nevada.....	600,000
New Mexico.....	250,000
Oregon.....	280,000
South Dakota.....	10,000
Utah.....	1,169,000
Washington.....	65,000
Wyoming.....	200,000
Total.....	4,000,000

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my hope is that this authority may be granted, and then the whole matter may be considered by the Appropriations Committee, and funds may then be made available in such amounts as the Congress may determine.

But I believe it is important to start now in the replanting of our forests. During the wartime period we harvested timber 50 percent faster than it was grown; and if that process is not reversed, we shall soon have exhausted our supply of timber.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of the purpose, but I am interested to know the amount of the authorization proposed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Three million dollars is proposed for the first year, and then there would be gradually increasing amounts, until finally a rather substantial sum would be reached. It would be \$5,000,000 in the second year, \$7,000,000 in the third year, \$8,000,000 in the fourth year, and thereafter \$10,000,000 a year for a long period; but all those are thus far merely proposed authorizations; and appropriations would be required, of course.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many trees does the Senator anticipate will be planted during the first year for which the \$3,000,000 expenditure will be made, if such appropriation is actually made?

Mr. ANDERSON. I cannot answer the question, because the difference in costs of plantation as between various areas is substantial. But I have already had inserted in the RECORD a list of the various States and the amount of acreage in each State. The total is somewhat in excess of 4,000,000 acres, and nearly every State in the Union is affected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands under administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits hereinbefore enumerated.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other lands under the administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation; and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for range revegetation.

The preamble was agreed to.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN ROBINSON REMOUNT STATION, NEBR.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 314) authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a brief comment on the bill, which I hope will be discussed by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

This bill presents a difficulty in respect to an important matter of policy which I think should be considered by the Senate in connection with the question of disposing of property belonging to all the people of the United States for the benefit of a group in a particular locality.

As I read the report on the bill, what it amounts to, when we get down to its very essence, is that it is proposed that approximately 43 acres of land be given to

the citizens of Crawford, Nebr., for public park purposes. I am at a loss to understand why all the people of the United States should donate a park to Crawford, Nebr. The record in this case shows that there is involved the question of an easement for a water main; and I certainly think the people of Crawford, Nebr., should have that easement. I think the record also shows that certain park improvements have been made by the people of Crawford, Nebr., because over the years they have been making use of these 43 acres for park purposes.

I should like to accommodate the Senators from Nebraska; but, so far as I am concerned, as in the last session of Congress, I think we must call a halt to giving away Federal property for the benefit of people in local communities, without their paying a reasonable or fair price for the benefit received.

I would much prefer this bill if it provided that the people of Crawford, Nebr., should pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the 43 acres of land.

Of course this bill involves a rather small item; but some time ago the Senators from Michigan encountered the same difficulty with respect to Fort Wayne; the Senators from Massachusetts ran into a similar difficulty in respect to a park in Massachusetts, and the Senators from Minnesota ran into the same difficulty in respect to certain property wanted by the University of Minnesota Medical School. Certainly we should follow a consistent principle in regard to all these matters; and I have not been shown to date that in such proposals as these an equitable solution would not be to have the citizens involved pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property.

So, Mr. President, subject to the right of the Senator from Nebraska to reply to this point, I wish to object.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, and I further wish to say that I am very sympathetic with him in regard to a general proviso that towns or municipalities or other groups which receive Federal property should pay something for it.

In this case, this particular piece of land was put under a revokable lease some 23 or 25 years ago. I suppose the land was then worth not more than \$5 an acre. Since then it has been improved by the people of the city of Crawford, so that it has provided public park services, not only to the people of Crawford and their community, but also to the persons living in the remount station grounds. At times hundreds of such persons enjoyed the benefits.

The land was made into a park. It is not a residential part of the city at all; it is a playground or recreation area. At the present time there is a concrete stadium there, for which the people of Crawford have paid.

In view of the free services on the part of the people of Crawford to the people attached to the remount station, who are our servants, I think the people of Crawford have paid a considerable

amount for this small tract of 43 acres, which is a part of some 15,000 or 20,000 acres of the remount station.

I have given the distinguished Senator from Oregon the other facts pertaining to the matter. The bill was passed in the Eightieth Congress, but it reached the House of Representatives too late for action there before the end of the session. That is why the bill has not been enacted before now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the bill is in need of amendment; therefore I object at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, may I have the understanding that we will try to bring up the bill at the close of the calendar call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot have any understanding about it.

Mr. BUTLER. I make a motion to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next bill.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF POMONA STATION OF AGRICULTURE REMOUNT SERVICE

The bill (S. 969) to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is their objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I correct in my understanding that we are now on Calendar 84, Senate bill 969?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If I may inquire, can the Senator from Oregon tell us whether consideration of this bill also is objected to on the same basis as the objection to the bill relative to Crawford, Nebr.?

Mr. MORSE. No. Mr. President, I have gone into this bill, and it is a good example of the distinction in principle to which I have heretofore alluded. In this case all the bill proposes to do is to return to the Kellogg Foundation the property which they sought to turn over and did turn over to the Federal Government for a particular use. The Federal Government no longer desiring the property for that purpose, I think it is perfectly proper to return the property to the Kellogg Foundation. It is not a case of giving away property that belongs to all the people of the United States, but rather returning property turned over to the Government for a particular use which the Government no longer wants to make use of. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "California", to strike out ", which was conveyed to the United States acting through the War Department (now Department of the Army) by W. K. Kellogg", and insert "which tract, originally in the ownership of W. K. Kellogg, was conveyed to the United States acting through the War Department (now Department of the Army)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Inc., without cost, the real property, comprising 812 acres, more or less, of the Agriculture Remount Station at Pomona, Calif., which was conveyed to the United States acting through the War Department (now Department of the Army) by W. K. Kellogg and subsequently transferred to the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the act of April 21, 1948 (62 Stat. 197), and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Inc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2663) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill. This is a very important bill to those who are identified with the Central Intelligence Agency. In modern times it is necessary to assemble all the information that can be obtained concerning our own national security and its relationship to the national security of other countries. All governments—we might as well be frank about it—utilize every reasonable agency they can to assemble desirable information concerning the activities of other governments. Sometimes in some countries men who are engaged in trying to find out what is going on lose their lives. They are caught, held as spies, and liquidated. They are never heard of again. The bill does not provide for any new activity. What it does particularly is to seek to safeguard information procured by agents of the Government so that it will not fall into the hands of enemy countries or potential enemy countries who would use the information to discover who the agents were, and kill them.

To my certain knowledge, in a certain area, not many years ago three good Americans who were trying to serve their Government by finding out whether the intentions of another government were strictly honorable were liquidated. The men were detected and killed. What the bill does is to seek to keep their names and identities out of the normal accounting channels, so that they cannot be picked up through the promiscuous dis-

semination of information. That is the principal point in the bill.

I shall not ask for its immediate consideration. I know there are some Senators, one of whom is my good friend and colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, who wants more time to look into it. But I wanted to make this brief explanation, so that Senators would have in mind what is in the bill as they consider it and read it in the future. I shall be very glad to yield, within the time limit that is left to me, to answer, if I can, any question any Senator may desire to raise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over, then.

DISCLOSURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES CODES, ETC.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 277) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communications intelligence activities of the United States was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in order to get an answer on the RECORD, I may say that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] explained to the Senator from Michigan that the words "lawful demands," do not mean that a subpoena by Congress will be necessary in order to obtain information for congressional committees, either of the Senate or House, or joint committees. Will the Senator from Texas make a statement to that effect for the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Michigan has correctly stated the meaning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator object?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over. I should also like to have the same statement made following the objection raised by me to Calendar 71, Senate bill 1070.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. By request, I object.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 53

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 12, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

Whereas the national forests of the United States contain approximately eighty million acres of the Nation's commercial timber lands and approximately eighty-three million acres of the Nation's important grazing lands; and

Whereas these national-forest lands comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries, and good forest and other vegetative cover is essential for watershed protection; and

Whereas these lands annually supply approximately four billion board-feet of forest products through twenty-seven thousand sales transactions and the demand for national forest timber is steadily increasing; and

Whereas these lands are the sole or main source of summer range

for ten million cattle and sheep grazed by thirty thousand livestock permittees whose livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon livestock grazed on national-forest ranges; and

Whereas these lands contain over four million acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and an additional four million acres of seriously depleted range lands; and

Whereas all of these lands are potentially capable of producing an important part of the timber and forage needs of local communities, and contributing to the protection of watersheds, thereby alleviating flood damage and insuring a continuing water supply, increasing opportunity for local employment, bringing greater stability to local communities, and increasing returns to counties in the national forests from their share of national forests receipts, together with other benefits; and

Whereas these lands will not restock or revegetate satisfactorily or within a reasonable time except through reforestation and revegetation or other measures to induce restocking or revegetation; and

Whereas it is practical to reforest these denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timber lands and revegetate these seriously depleted range lands in a period of fifteen years; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide reasonable continuity of reforestation and revegetation programs in order to insure effective, efficient, and economical operations: Therefore be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

1 That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate
2 and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation
3 and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands
4 under administration or control of the Forest Service of the
5 Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits
6 hereinbefore enumerated.

7 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
8 of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other
9 lands under the administration or control of the Forest
10 Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the
11 acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there
12 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available
13 until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000
14 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$5,000,000 for
15 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$7,000,000 for the
16 fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$8,000,000 for the fiscal
17 year ending June 30, 1954; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
18 ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent
19 year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and
20 thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation;
21 and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951;
22 \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952;
23 \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953;
24 \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954;
25 \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a

1 like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal
2 year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts
3 as may be needed for range revegetation.

Passed the Senate April 11, 1949.

Attest:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

Secretary.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST Session

S. J. RES. 53

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

APRIL 12, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION

(of Forest and Range Lands of National Forests)

HEARINGS

BEFORE

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF

THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

{ (FIRST SESSION

ON

H. J. Res. 167 and S. J. Res. 53

MAY 13, 1949

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

Serial X



UNITED STATES

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1949

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3

WALTER K. GRANGER, Utah, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina

EUGENE WORLEY, Texas

PAT SUTTON, Tennessee

JAMES F. LIND, Pennsylvania

EDWIN A. HALL, New York

SID SIMPSON, Illinois

ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, California

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page
Clawson, Marion, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.....	11
Granger, C. M., Assistant Chief, National Forest Divisions, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture (accompanied by W. L. Dutton, Division of Range Management).....	5
Mansfield, Hon. Mike, Member of Congress from Montana.....	2
Text of House Joint Resolution 167.....	1

REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION OF FOREST AND RANGE LANDS OF NATIONAL FORESTS

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1949

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Agriculture Committee met at 10:15 a. m., and proceeded to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 167 and Senate Joint Resolution 53, Hon. Walter K. Granger (chairman), presiding.

Mr. GRANGER. The committee has before it House Joint Resolution 167 and also Senate Joint Resolution 53, which I understand are identical bills. The House resolution was introduced by our distinguished colleague from Montana, Congressman Mansfield, and is as follows:

[H. J. Res. 167, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

JOINT RESOLUTION To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes

Whereas the national forests of the United States contain approximately eighty million acres of the Nation's commercial timberlands and approximately eighty-three million acres of the Nation's important grazing lands; and

Whereas these national-forest lands comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries, and good forest and other vegetative cover is essential for watershed protection; and

Whereas these lands annually supply approximately four billion board-feet of forest products through twenty-seven thousand sales transactions, and the demand for national forest timber is steadily increasing; and

Whereas these lands are the sole or main source of summer range for ten million cattle and sheep grazed by thirty thousand livestock permittees whose livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon livestock grazed on national-forest ranges; and

Whereas these lands contain over four million acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and an additional four million acres of seriously depleted range lands; and

Whereas all of these lands are potentially capable of producing an important part of the timber and forage needs of local communities, and contributing to the protection of watersheds, thereby alleviating flood damage and insuring a continuing water supply, increasing opportunity for local employment, bringing greater stability to local communities, and increasing returns to counties in the national forests from their share of national-forests receipts, together with other benefits; and

Whereas these lands will not restock or revegetate satisfactorily or within a reasonable time except through reforestation and revegetation or other measures to induce restocking or revegetation; and

Whereas it is practical to reforest these denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and revegetate these seriously depleted range lands in a period of fifteen years; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide reasonable continuity of reforestation and revegetation programs in order to insure effective, efficient, and economical operations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate

and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands under administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits hereinbefore enumerated.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other lands under the administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation; and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for range revegetation.

We will be glad to hear from him now.

STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE MANSFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am appearing today in behalf of House Joint Resolution 167, providing for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests and for other purposes.

As some of you gentlemen know, I live in Missoula, Mont., which is the headquarters of District No. 1 of the United States Forest Service; consequently, I have a great interest in what this agency does and a great admiration for what they have already accomplished.

This bill was introduced jointly by Senator Anderson in the other body and myself in the House. The bill introduced in the Senate passed unanimously in that body about 2 weeks ago, and I am here today to ask that this committee report this particular measure out favorably after they have investigated and looked into the facts.

For the information of the committee, a somewhat similar bill was introduced in the last Congress by Congressman Knutson of Minnesota, but, because of the press of business toward the end of the session, this measure was not acted on; consequently, nothing was forthcoming from the House.

This is a very important measure, because, after all, the Forest Service is the guardian of much of our natural resources, and if we do not do something along the lines of reforestation and revegetation, this property which is held in trust for the people of the United States is going to become more and more worthless. On the other hand, if we authorize this measure and the funds are forthcoming, it will mean that practically worthless property today will become of increasing value as the years go on.

Eighty million acres of the Nation's commercial timberlands and 83,000,000 acres of the Nation's important grazing lands are found in the national forests. These timberlands annually supply 4,000,000,000 feet of forest products through 27,000 sales transactions, and the demand for national forest timber is increasing steadily. These grazing lands are the sole or main source of summer range for 10,000,000 cattle and sheep grazed by 30,000 livestock permittees whose

livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon a continuing supply of range forage. Many communities are dependent on the utilization of these national forest resources.

These same lands also comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries.

The national forests contain a substantial acreage of timberland that is either denuded or badly understocked. Some of this acreage will come back naturally to desirable tree growth, but over 4,000,000 acres of the commercial timberlands must be reforested artificially if the potential capacity of the lands is to be utilized for the production of forest products. This land is widely distributed. There is a sizable job of reforestation in north Idaho and western Montana in the extensive old burns. Even larger areas of lands acquired after clear-cutting and burning are still in need of replanting in the Lake States. The Pacific Northwest, California, and the Southern States are other regions where extensive reforestation is needed on the national forests.

The continued heavy demand for lumber and other timber products continues and is resulting in a terrific drain upon our forest resources. We should take every measure feasibly within our means to keep our commercial timberlands in a continuous productive condition.

Four million acres of these range and watershed lands are in a seriously depleted condition from the standpoint of both soil stability and forage production. In their present condition, they are producing nowhere near the amount of forage they should. Moreover, serious erosion hazards that in some cases affect entire communities are being created. Beyond question, there is immediate and pressing need for a program designed to check the present downward trend in both soils and vegetation and to restore the depleted areas to maximum productivity.

Range and watershed rehabilitation can be accomplished in many cases by drastic reductions in livestock use—in some cases remove all livestock—and wait for nature to go about the task in her own way. Her way, as we all know, is long and laborious. In some areas, decades will be required to do the job if nature is left to her own devices. And even then the results would fall far short of what could be accomplished by other means. Such procedure would obviously be insufficient, wasteful, and unconstructive. Moreover, it would defeat the very worth-while objective of doing everything possible to provide additional forage for livestock at a time when the world is in need of all the food that can be produced.

Though there is no way of avoiding substantial reductions in livestock numbers in many national forest ranges, the need for reduction can be reduced through a plan-wise program of revegetation. There is no longer the slightest doubt about the practicability of such an undertaking. The Forest Service has already demonstrated that many depleted range and watershed areas can be restored to production within two or three years and made to support from five to ten times the number of livestock now carried.

The major part of the reforestation and revegetation job can be accomplished in 15 years. A program of this size and duration, if carried through without interruption, will result in the cheapest and most efficient manner of handling this job. This work must be done eventually. Continued postponement of the job will result in the

work being more costly and the benefits further delayed into the distant future. This joint resolution would place Congress on record as recognizing the need for an accelerated program of reforestation, range and watershed revegetation. It would also authorize appropriation of the funds needed to carry out such a program.

Mr. GRANGER. I see on page 3 of your bill, beginning in line 13, the words "fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, that the authorization is divided equally between reforestation and revegetation." Is that right? What is the difference?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The difference is that in the revegetation in the year 1951 it comes to \$5,000,000, but in reforestation in the year 1951, the fiscal year, it comes to \$1,500,000. The total figures for both programs would be \$133,000,000 for revegetation and \$40,750,000 for reforestation over the 15-year period. Of course, the chairman will understand that if a program like this is not undertaken at the earliest practicable moment, it is going to cost a lot more in the end to bring these lands back into productive use.

Mr. GRANGER. What do you say the over-all authorization would be for 15 years?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be \$173,750,000, approximately.

Mr. WHITE. In the meantime, you may find a lot of that land at the bottoms of our reservoirs behind the hydroelectric dams. Is not that right, Mr. Mansfield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true. But, generally speaking, arrangements can be worked out on a satisfactory basis between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Reclamation insofar as those dams are concerned. I do not know too much about the other dams of the country, but I know in Montana we are building a project out there known as Hungry Horse, and a large part of the Hungry Horse Reservoir is going to be on what is denuded and burned-over forest land today. So, in that sense, Mr. White, we are putting that kind of land to a certain amount of practical use, even though not in the way this bill would envisage.

Mr. GRANGER. The main proposition is, without doubt, the reseeding, revegetation, and reforestation of our forests, but, as Brother Rich would say, where are you going to get the money?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is something for this committee to worry about. All we are seeking now is the authorization, and getting the money is the same old story you have had for a number of years of the conflict between the Appropriations Committee and committees working on legislative matters. If this committee thinks the idea is sound, I think it would be worth their while to include this and consider very seriously the possibility of recommending this measure do pass.

Coming from the West, as I do, and as I know the chairman does as well, and also the gentleman from California, we are all aware of what this means to that part of the country; but, as I have indicated in my testimony, it affects not only the West but the Lake States and also southern areas as well.

Mr. GRANGER. Then, in the first year of the ultimate program, it would be \$6,500,000; is that right?

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the first year, it would be \$3,000,000 for revegetation and \$1,500,000 for reforestation, or \$4,500,000.

Mr. GRANGER. It would be \$4,500,000 the first year?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. The second year it would be \$6,750,000?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. Do you have any other witnesses here, Mr. Mansfield, who want to speak in behalf of this?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, sir. I believe there may be some individuals from the Forest Service, if you would care to question them.

Mr. GRANGER. Are there any individuals, outside of the agency, who have any testimony for or against this legislation?

(No response.)

Mr. GRANGER. Thank you very much, Mr. Mansfield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this bill was introduced in the Senate by the former Secretary of Agriculture, Senator Anderson, and has passed that body unanimously.

I thank you.

Mr. GRANGER. We have with us Assistant Forester Mr. Granger and will be glad to hear from him now.

STATEMENT OF C. M. GRANGER, ASSISTANT CHIEF, NATIONAL FOREST DIVISIONS, ACCOMPANIED BY W. L. DUTTON, ASSISTANT CHIEF, DIVISION OF RANGE MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mansfield has told the committee what the over-all purposes and benefits of this legislation are. We feel that those benefits are very real and that their relation to the various large-scale programs of the Government warrants the acceleration which is proposed in this measure. Our flood-control activities, the building of all of these reservoirs for the generation of power or for flood control or the improvement of navigation, or greatly extending our irrigated areas, are all affected by the condition of the mountain watersheds from which the major portion of the water flow comes. So that, from the standpoint of watershed treatment alone in the western part of the country, we feel a much more rapid reforestation coverage and revegetation program would be a fine investment as a corollary to these other very extensive undertakings in which the Government is now engaged.

The principal purpose of the time factor in here and the setting up of the authorizations over a 15-year period is to give the necessary continuity to the program so that both the reforestation and revegetation undertaking can be carried out in an efficient manner at the lowest possible cost.

As I am sure most of you realize, the reforestation job involves the growing of trees in nurseries to various ages, and when we have to use trees that are three or four years old for planting we should know in advance what our program is going to be for several years ahead in order that we may gage the program in our nurseries accordingly. Furthermore, it involves necessary arrangements for equipment and labor, which are very difficult to handle in an economical and effective manner if there is a rapid fluctuation up and down in the intensity of these programs.

So we are very hopeful that this measure will receive favorable attention in the interest of resources management, watershed management, and the effective and efficient conduct of the program.

Up to the present time, the extent we are financed for doing this replanting work in various parts of the national forests enables us to plant about 35,000 acres a year, and a little arithmetic will show, with 4,000,000 acres to plant, that it would take us well over 100 years to do the job. On the revegetation end, with the money which is now provided, we can plant between 75,000 and 100,000 acres a year with range reseeding, and we have 4,000,000 acres; so that will take us in the neighborhood of 40 to 50 years. So it is obvious that under our present financing of programs we will move ahead very, very slowly.

These amounts here which are to be authorized are the total amounts and not increases over and above the present appropriations. For example, we now receive something over \$1,300,000 a year for reforestation; so that for the first year the \$3,000,000 would include that \$1,300,000. On our revegetation program, the appropriation for fiscal year 1950, if the House cut is restored, would be just under \$800,000; so that would be just a little more than one-half of the \$1,500,000 asked for here as an authorization for the first year of the program.

Mr. GRANGER. So all of the appropriations now before one House or the other are included in this authorization so far as your reseeding and reforestation is concerned?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. That is right; yes, sir.

The reforestation program will build up to a peak of around something like 380,000 acres a year as compared with 35,000 and then gradually drop off by virtue of the necessity of the petering out of the production of nursery stock. The other program will go up to the \$3,000,000 level and will carry along there until completion.

Those are the high lights of the situation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRANGER. You would think, looking at it from the standpoint of the expense, that we would have the larger appropriations on the first end, and then you would continue to decrease the appropriations as you had more acreages replanted. But you say you have to raise the seedlings first?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. That is right. On the reforestation end of the job, you have to greatly increase your nursery output before you can step your program up to these dimensions. On revegetation and range reseeding, it is much easier, but there, again, it does require that we get the seed and more equipment. So that we could not effectively spend all of the money in the first year that is provided for at the peak of the program.

Mr. GRANGER. So far as reforestation is concerned, is this Nation-wide?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. The whole program, I guess, is Nation-wide.

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. The revegetation is confined to the Western States in the main; almost all of it is out there.

Mr. GRANGER. How long has the Federal Government had jurisdiction over the forests and forest lands?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. The national forests have been under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture since 1905.

Mr. GRANGER. When did we first start to plant any grass or trees or do any improving either on the range or on the forests and desert?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. I do not recall the exact date, but reforestation job has been going on, I suppose, for 35 to 40 years in a small way. It got the big boost at the time of the Civilian Conservation Corps and then dropped back again.

The reseeding job has also been going on, not for that long a period, but for quite a period of years, and we have successfully reseeded something over 200,000 acres of national forest land and reforested something over 1,000,000 acres of national forest land.

Mr. GRANGER. Where you have had overgrazing, what has been your remedy, if any?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. The remedy has been a combination of things. It involves reseeding, involves the construction of range improvements which make the management of the range easier, and the development of additional water holes makes it possible to utilize range that would not otherwise be usable. And, as you know, it involves in that program reducing the numbers of both livestock and wildlife where there is serious overgrazing.

Now, this reseeding program will not do away with the necessity for a reduction in numbers either of domestic livestock or wildlife, but it will reduce that need. So it is one of the measures that we regard as very important in the over-all program of getting the numbers of livestock and wildlife on the national forests in balance with the permanent productive capacity of the national forest ranges.

The revegetation undertaking is self-liquidating in that, according to our experience so far, it will return at least 5 percent interest on the investment and in many cases, over a reasonable period of time, will retire the investment in range reseeding, because it greatly increases, of course, the carrying capacity of the national forest land which is reseeded, and that means a much larger revenue from a given area of national forest land arising from the permittee use by domestic livestock.

Mr. GRANGER. It has been my observation that where you have done the reseeding of a large tract—and I know of one tract, I believe the biggest in the country, of 25,000 or 30,000 acres in one tract—the reseeding brought that tract back again that was previously practically valueless for anything. All it had on it before the reseeding was done was sagebrush that livestock did not eat.

I am wondering if such a program as this would make it possible to graze more livestock rather than reducing the number of livestock on this land. You certainly have had a program of reduction for the last 10 or 15 years, have you not?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. And we have run into a lot of difficulty with the people grazing on the public domain as a result of being forced to keep the range land at least a little stable, but all you could do was reduce the allotment; is not that true?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. Well, we have done other things. We have done some reseeding and have constructed quite a lot of range improvements; but, along with that, we have had to make many reductions, some quite heavy.

Mr. GRANGER. Do you know how many livestock have been taken off forest reservations in the last 5 or 10 years?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. I would like to ask Mr. Dutton to answer that question, as he may have some figures on it.

Mr. DUTTON. I do not have the exact figure, Mr. Chairman, but, subject to correction, the reduction in the last 10 years has been in the neighborhood of 10 to 15 percent.

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. This sagebrush land you speak of, Mr. Chairman, is typical of considerable areas that once supported a very fine stand of forage, and then, because of overgrazing, the forage has almost disappeared so that the lands have little or no value for livestock grazing. We have found that they can be brought back to grass very effectively and, to that extent, they will increase the grazing capacity of the national forest range lands, but they will not do away with the need for continuing the program of reductions. They will diminish that need.

Mr. DUTTON. I might add I believe you would be entirely correct in your assumption that in this tract you have in mind and numerous other tracts, where forage was almost depleted at the time of reseeding, the grazing capacity has been increased tremendously for that reseeded area; so that you would be correct in that.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask, Mr. Granger, if money which may be authorized under this bill for the revegetation program would also permit the Department to eradicate brush and reseed areas from which the brush was eradicated.

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. You are thinking of some brush ranges in California, Mr. White?

Mr. WHITE. In particular; yes.

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. I would like to ask Mr. Dutton whether any of that California brush range is in this program. I am not sure about that.

Mr. DUTTON. As I understand it, there is an authorization for the removal of brush, although it is my recollection that very little of the California brush land would be in the reseeded area. It could be done under the legislation.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, we who are familiar with this situation in the West all know that not only is the forest itself benefited, but so are the livestock, as a result of having forage produced, but the big thing is the additional supply of water for irrigation and other uses that has been realized. It is the most important thing to all of those communities. Is not that right?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. This is a program of far-reaching effect. Even the rivers for navigation—the Missouri and the Mississippi—would benefit two-fold from a program of this kind. If we could ever get to the point where we could do enough revegetation and the planting of trees, it would permit us to stop doing so much work in building dikes down on the banks of the Mississippi. It seems to this the right approach to soil conservation in the whole country—this planting of grass and trees.

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, it not only protects the watersheds against floods and erosion to a great degree, but we have found by our experimental work in Colorado that the forests, when cut over according to certain methods, will increase the flow of usable water quite immeasurably—up to as much as 30 percent. So that, if you have a well forested watershed and then treat it properly by cutting in certain ways, removing certain portions of the stand, you get a greater yield of water than you were getting from the virgin forests or than

you get from a completely denuded area. Theoretically, you would get most water from a denuded area, and, if it was not full of mud and one thing and another, it would be all right, but that renders its usability much less. So, thinking in terms of the watershed coverage by vegetation, we can, by proper management, at least in part of the western territory, get greater yields of water when we have a well forested watershed properly managed.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. Do you have any idea how much of the land which will be affected by this resolution is now or might be in watershed areas when the various watershed programs are drawn up and approved?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. Except for some of the flat lands in the South, all of it is on watersheds, and it will have some effect on the watershed conditions and flow. A considerable part of the acreage to be reforested is in the flat lands of the South.

I might just give a few figures, if you would like to have them. On the reforestation part of the job, we have 342,000 acres in the South. Not all of that is in the flat woods; so some of that has watershed value. All of the rest of it is in the West or in the Lake States where it has, in most cases, a very high watershed significance. The revegetation and reseeding of the range lands, as I say, are almost entirely in the West on mountainous lands and has a particularly valuable contribution to make to watershed improvement.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. So the work contemplated here, if started now, would presumably decrease the amount of work that would have to be done under these flood-control programs when and as they are approved. Is that deduction correct?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. It would certainly reduce the necessity for some of the physical upstream structures that will have to be installed as part of the Department of Agriculture's program if we can get this land covered with such revegetation.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. Some of the flood-control lands are also reforested and planted with vegetation where necessary?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. That is right.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. And a considerable portion of those lands would presumably be included in flood-control projects, and this would assist in the solution of their problem?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. A very large part of it would be included in their flood-control undertakings.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. Can you give me the code citations of your fund authorizations for this type of work?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. I cannot give that offhand.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. I find one of them in title XVI, 576 (a), which is the authorization for some reforestation, but it is only \$400,000. You say you got considerably more than that this year; so you must have some other authorizations.

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. Yes. There is a basic authorization for work on national forests of various kinds, Mr. Heimburger, that I am not able to state at the moment.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. Could you provide us with those citations?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. Yes.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. Since this merely increases the authorization which you now have, would you be opposed to some language in the resolution which would show that it is a consolidation and increase of the present authorization and not entirely a new authorization?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. The authorizations we have now, except for this one you speak of there, are not in terms of dollars; the other authorizations are in terms of authorizing activities. As I recall now, they are contained in continuing language in the appropriation bills; so that there would not be any dollar conflict as to the authorization.

Mr. GRANGER. That is the language in the appropriation bill authorization?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. The appropriation bill year after year contains a preamble to the appropriation for the national forests which lists a large number of activities which are authorized to be done with the money appropriated thereunder, and the money is appropriated in a lump sum and no specific amounts are set out for any one of these individual activities such as reforestation, revegetation, and so forth.

Mr. GRANGER. It would need this language, then, as this is more or less an original authorization for this specific work?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. No; it is not needed to authorize appropriations for that work. The main purpose of this is to express congressional intent as to the dimensions of the program to be undertaken and the time limits within which it would be desirable to accomplish it. In other words, there is no legal basis needed for an appropriation of funds for these purposes, but there is need for the adoption of a program in this particular field.

Mr. GRANGER. It seems to me, as I remember the authorization in the appropriation, it was funds that were lumped together to do certain things.

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. Well, we get an appropriation now of around \$25,000,000 to \$26,000,000 for protection and management of national forests, and in the language of the appropriation bill that covers a large number of activities. But we are not restricted by the appropriation language to using that money on any specific activity.

Mr. GRANGER. Do you care to make any further statement, Mr. Dutton?

Mr. DUTTON. I might add just one statement. I would like to emphasize something which I am sure you all know, because it is prevalent in Utah, and that is the extreme shortage of spring range. In this reseeding work, especially in Utah, Nevada, Idaho, and other neighboring States, we are using a lot of crested wheat grass. As you know, this crested wheat grass matures earlier than the native vegetation; so that where we are able to reseed we are thus able to provide range about two to three weeks earlier than would be the case with the use of native vegetation, thereby saving the stockmen the need for feeding expensive concentrates. I wanted to get that in the record.

Mr. GRANGER. I agree to that. I know that is a fact, and I have seen some marvelous demonstrations which convince me it is far beyond all of the experimental stuff we have now.

Mr. DUTTON. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. Are there other experiments to be carried on to determine where grass can be planted in other parts of the mountains? There is a good deal of forest ground out there that we call waste ground, and I understand that some investigation is being carried on to see if it was valuable, either for growing trees, grass, or what not.

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. That is correct. We have a continuing range research program which is endeavoring to discover successful methods of reseeding range lands where we do not now know just how to treat

them, and our knowledge of how to do successful reseeding is expanding more every year, so that we are now able in all of our western regions to undertake reseeding work with pretty good assurance that it will be a success.

Mr. GRANGER. But none of these funds are going into the actual work; none of these funds are going to be needed for research?

Mr. C. M. GRANGER. No, sir; these funds are all for the action program.

Mr. GRANGER. Thank you very much.

Now we have Mr. Clawson of the Bureau of Land Management.

Do you desire to make a statement?

Also, let me ask the question of those who have entered the hearing room since this hearing began if there is anyone who wants to speak in opposition or for this legislation, as some of the members of the committee are asking me if there is any opposition to it. If there is any opposition here, we would like to hear about it.

(No response.)

STATEMENT OF MARION CLAWSON, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I do not have a formal report from the Department available this morning, but one will be forthcoming.

Generally speaking, we thoroughly endorse the purposes and specific programs laid out in here. We do not pretend to know about the amounts and acreages, since they lie inside the national forests, but we assume the Forest Service is correct on their figures.

We would like to point out at this time, however, that in addition to national forest lands there are substantial acreages of other Federal lands, mostly in the West, which are also in need of reforestation and revegetation. As the committee knows, the higher mountain areas by and large, are in the national forests, and the lower foothill areas or valley areas, the more desert areas, the drier areas, are either in grazing districts or Indian reservations or other forms of public land, including in some instances, of course, national parks which lie at the higher levels. Many of those lands are as urgently in need of reforestation or revegetation as are the national forest lands.

We estimate approximately 300,000 acres of land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior need reforestation. That compares with the 4,000,000-acre figure which the Forest Service has estimated for the national forests and reflects the fact, of course, that most of the publicly owned or federally owned forests are in the national forests. But some of them are under the jurisdiction of our Department. And there are approximately 300,000 acres of land that, once forested, are capable of growing excellent commercial forests that are not now restocking and that ought to be replanted.

The total cost of doing that would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$6,000,000 and would be, in our judgment, a thoroughly sound investment from the financial point of view. There are somewhere in the neighborhood of 22,000,000 acres of grazing land that might be revegetated. As I said a moment ago, a good deal of the land under our jurisdiction is a good deal drier than that in the national forests, and a good deal of it would be very fine if you could get it revegetated;

but as you get out into the drier and drier regions it becomes increasingly more difficult and increasingly more hazardous to do. That is in the sense that your failures are going to be higher and even your success for forage production will be less. But we feel there are 22,000,000 acres which might be successfully revegetated by reseeding grass—successful not only from the point of view of getting a stand of grass to grow but financially successful and successful from the conservation point of view.

Because of the location of the lands, the national forests frequently contribute a very large proportion of the total flow of the different streams, and Federal lands outside of the national forests contribute a much smaller proportion of the flow. On the other hand, because of the precipitation that the natural vegetation induces, many of the lands of which I am speaking and which are under my jurisdiction contribute a proportionately large percentage of silt that goes into the streams. In the Colorado, the bulk—80 percent—of the silt comes from areas that contribute less than 20 percent of the flow. That is a figure which is frequently used.

Now, we have no illusions that you can stop all of that silt movement, by any means, but we think a good deal of it could be reduced in the forest areas, and, at the same time, the operation would be profitable from a financial point of view.

We are not at this stage prepared to submit an amendment to this resolution or a bill calling for a specific program, but we do want the record to show that we are very much interested in it and that at some stage—I think not in the very distant future—we will be submitting a rather specific program to the Congress.

I think that essentially concludes my statement. If there are any questions, I would be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. GRANGER. Did I understand you to say you had some forest lands under your jurisdiction?

Mr. CLAWSON. Yes, sir—of range and formerly reseeded lands, in western Oregon in particular, about 2½ million acres of forest lands that were placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in 1916 and again in 1937, when the 1937 Oregon and California Act was passed. Those lands are very similar to the national forest lands in that same area. And there are other places in the West where there are lands very similar to national forest lands in the sense of having timber on them which are under our jurisdiction. The acreages are relatively small, of course.

Mr. GRANGER. What do you use them for—grazing or timber?

Mr. CLAWSON. Timber.

Mr. GRANGER. For the production of timber?

Mr. CLAWSON. Yes. We brought in last year between 4.5 and 5 million dollars in receipts from the sale of timber.

Mr. GRANGER. I am very glad you appeared here this morning, and I sincerely hope your Department does work out a program of reseeding and planting of trees.

While you probably have less than 9 inches of rainfall whereas the forest areas usually get about 13 inches or somewhere near there, I think there are many millions of acres that could be reseeded to fine advantage. I have seen many fine results of your Bureau of Land Management where, as a matter of fact, all you needed to do was to take off the sagebrush or take out one-half of the competition of the

brush and enable grass to grow again, and you have some very wonderful demonstrations that I have seen.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WHITE. I just want to ask Mr. Clawson a question in connection with a matter that came up in the committee not very long ago. Someone on the committee mentioned the Government's purchases of land in Mississippi. I will quote the remark he made so that you will get it. He said, "That outfit has gone land crazy."

Is that under your jurisdiction—the purchase of this land in Mississippi?

Mr. CLAWSON. No. We have no authorization to purchase any land and have, to my knowledge, never purchased any land at all.

Mr. WHITE. Who does that land purchasing that was referred to?

Mr. CLAWSON. It may be done by any one of a number of Government agencies, including the Forest Service as well as others. The only connection we have with it is that we do administer the leasing of oil and gas rights on public or federally owned land, except for certain mineral reservations, including a post-office site, and we do administer the oil and gas on acquired lands in Mississippi and other States. But we do not have any authority to purchase lands.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the agency to which he referred was the Forest Service.

If there are no further questions, thank you very much.

×

REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION

JUNE 6, 1949.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. J. Res. 53]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

STATEMENT

This resolution authorizes a 15-year program of reforestation and revegetation of national-forest timber and range lands. The Forest Service estimates that there are 2,200,000 acres of national-forest lands requiring artificial replanting and about 4,000,000 acres of its grazing lands which require revegetation. It has set up a program to accomplish this reforestation and revegetation in 15 years and the authorization proposed in this resolution is estimated to be sufficient to do that work.

The resolution increases to a maximum of \$10,000,000 a year in 1955 the authorization for reforestation on national-forest lands, and to \$3,000,000 in 1955 the authorization for revegetation of range lands administered by the Forest Service.

Current appropriations for this work are about \$1,300,000 a year for reforestation and about \$800,000 a year for revegetation of range lands.

A period of preparation, in the growing and procurement of seeds, seedlings, and equipment, will be necessary before operations reach their full scope. Therefore, the authorizations for the first 5 years are on a gradually increasing scale. The specific authorizations terminate in 1965, by which time it is contemplated that the work will be completed. Thereafter only such amounts—presumably smaller—as will be necessary for incidental reforestation and revegetation are authorized.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS

Favorable reports on the resolution have been submitted by both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. They are printed herewith and made a part of this report.

MARCH 4, 1949.

HON. ELMER THOMAS,

*Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Reference is made to the request made today for an immediate report to your committee on Senate Joint Resolution 53, designed to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

As to reforestation:

Out of the approximately 80,000,000 acres of commercial timberlands within the national forests, there are approximately 4,000,000 acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked lands. Reforestation of these lands is required to bring them back into timber production. Present unsatisfactory stocking of these lands has resulted primarily from either forest fires or mistreatment by previous owners before acquisition and addition of them to the national forests.

The Forest Service of this Department has been conducting reforestation operations on the national forests for more than 40 years. Satisfactory and efficient methods for conduct of the work are thoroughly known and tested. A total of 1,270,571 acres have been successfully planted to date on the national forests. Reforestation was one of the major activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps during the 1930's. The highest accomplishment in a single year was in 1936 when 214,306 acres were planted.

During the war reforestation work was virtually suspended. Currently \$1,326,862 is available for reforestation work on the national forests. Because of high labor rates and costs for rehabilitating nurseries after suspension of activity during the war years, a rate of planting of only around 30,000 acres annually has been achieved in the postwar period.

The Forest Service has studied ways and means to accomplish the reforestation job on the national forests in the cheapest and most efficient manner. An objective has been set up to do the job in a 15-year period. It is essential that the program be carried on without interruption to obtain the lowest cost, since as much as 5 years may be needed for some species between the time of seed collection and the field planting of the resulting nursery-grown stock. There is general agreement that this reforestation work should be done eventually. Postponement or delays in doing this work will result in added expense and further delay of benefits into the distant future.

The 15-year reforestation program recommended by the Forest Service contemplates planting of 2,200,000 acres of nonstocked lands and 1,000,000 acres of those understocked lands which are most critically in need of additional stocking. The total cost of this work, including essential plantation care and release of existing plantations and those to be established, is approximately \$119,000,000, or an average expenditure of \$7,933,333 annually. During the first year of such a program the funds needed would be approximately \$3,000,000 with gradual rising amounts as nurseries are developed and adequate amounts of nursery stock are grown. At about the midpoint of the 15-year period, an expenditure of as much as \$10,000,000 may be advisable to attain maximum efficiency. Toward the end of the 15-year period substantial curtailments in expenditures could be made as the program is completed in certain areas and reductions in expenditures for nursery operations and maintenance become possible.

As to revegetation:

Out of the approximately 83,000,000 acres of land used for grazing in the national forests, about 4,000,000 acres are in a seriously depleted condition. Much of this area is located on important watersheds which have been damaged by past overgrazing. Such lands are not producing anywhere near the amount of forage they should. Moreover, in their present condition, they constitute serious erosion hazards which threaten entire communities. There is immediate and pressing need for an enlarged program designed to check the present downward trend in both soils and vegetation, and to restore the depleted areas to maximum productivity.

Range revegetation work on the national forests has now advanced from experimental to project stages. As in the case of reforestation, effective methods have

been developed and tested and are now being applied. Depleted range and watershed areas can be restored to productivity within 2 or 3 years and made to support from 5 to 10 times the number of livestock now carried.

A total of more than 200,000 acres of national forest range land have been successfully reseeded to date. For fiscal year 1949 the budget continued a \$543,000 item for range revegetation. Subsequently this item was increased by \$250,000 on the floor of the House during debate on the 1949 agricultural appropriation bill. Overgrazed ranges in a good many national forest areas require drastic reductions in livestock use. In some areas decades will be required to restore the vegetation on such areas if nature is left to her own devices. And even then the results would fall far short of what could be accomplished by other means. Such procedure would obviously be insufficient and wasteful. Moreover, it would defeat the very worth-while objective of doing everything practicable to provide additional forage for livestock at a time when the world is in need of all the food that can be produced.

The more constructive approach is one of range and watershed rehabilitation through a planned program of revegetation, along with a somewhat less drastic reduction in livestock numbers. It is recommended that the revegetation job be set up for completion in a 15-year period as provided for in the resolution.

During the first year of this program approximately \$1,500,000 would be needed with progressive increases thereafter as adequate supplies of seed, equipment, and materials are made available. Beginning with the fifth year of the program it is expected that the project would level off to an expenditure of about \$3,000,000 annually until completion of the presently needed program.

Appropriations under authorization of this resolution would remain available until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year (p. 3, lines 12 and 13, of the resolution). Nursery operations are in full swing in late June and early July. Sowing, transplanting, and weeding operations should be scheduled in accordance with local weather conditions without regard to closure of the fiscal year on June 30. Reforestation work can be done more economically and effectively under this provision of the resolution.

Senate Joint Resolution 53 would establish a policy of Congress and authorize appropriations for a planned reforestation and revegetation program in the national forests. Enactment of the resolution is recommended.

In view of the time limitation we have not obtained advice from the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of this bill to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN, *Secretary.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1949.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. COOLEY: Reference is made to your request for a report on Senate Joint Resolution 53, to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

I have no objection to the enactment of the joint resolution.

Senate Joint Resolution 53 relates to the national-forest lands only, but the constructive objectives of the proposed legislation should apply with equal force to the vast areas administered by this Department. It would result in greater efficacy in achieving these desirable objectives if the Congress adopted a uniform and broad policy of rehabilitation and conservation covering all of the public lands.

There remain in the continental United States somewhat under 415,000,000 acres of public domain. National-forest lands, administered by the Department of Agriculture, comprise about one-third of this acreage. Most of the balance, or 280,000,000 acres, is administered by the Interior Department, including 170,000,000 acres of vacant land (132,000,000 acres in grazing districts), 55,000,000 acres in Indian reservations, and 12,000,000 acres in national parks and monuments. The remaining lands are in reclamation, military, and other reservations. Major portions of the public lands, adjacent to or surrounding the national forests, are also important as watershed lands, as a source of water for domestic, industrial, and irrigation purposes, as range for livestock and as habitat for

wildlife. Of the 280,000,000 acres administered by this Department, nearly 20,000,000 acres have been given conservation treatment; 60½ million acres are critically eroding and another 73¼ million acres need early attention to prevent serious erosion.

Large areas of the public lands lie where the western rivers originate. A disproportionately large part of the silt load in streams and of the damage resulting from floods has its start in these public lands. The silt load of such streams can be reduced by protection of the timber and vegetation cover, thus controlling soil erosion and regulating silt load.

The need for a long-range departmental program of reforestation is demonstrated by examining the O. & C. (revested Orgeon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road) timber lands of western Oregon. The O. & C. lands, embracing about 2½ million acres, are administered directly by the Bureau of Land Management of this Department. A large part of these lands which are primarily suited to forest-production purposes are not now restocking naturally, due to repeated burnings or other causes. Field estimates indicate that a total area of approximately 150,000 acres out of the 2½ million acres of O. & C. lands are in need of early artificial reforestation. The urgent nature of the problem is indicated in part by the repeated floods in Willamette River, which drains a large part of the O. & C. area, and in part by the revenue-producing capacity of similar forested lands in the same general vicinity.

There are an additional 150,000 acres of public lands throughout the Western States, suitable for forestry, which will not restock naturally and which should be reforested artificially at the earliest possible opportunity. In general, the major basis of reforestation should be the considered expectation of economic returns from forest crops adequate to reimburse the Government for capital outlays and carrying charges for new plantings. But there are other benefits, such as soil-saving, flood and erosion prevention, and protection of watershed, which justify reforestation programs.

Long-range plans for reforestation of such lands require adequate anticipated annual financing. On the basis of an estimated cost of \$20 per acre of successful planting, the 300,000 acres of public domain and O. & C. lands would require an outlay of \$6,000,000, spread out advantageously over a period of 10 years.

The Interior Department administers 170,000,000 acres of range lands which supply forage for more than 12,000,000 head of livestock. Fully half of this range land needs restorative work, since approximately 85,000,000 acres are in serious condition due to undeterred erosion and vegetation depletion. These depleted areas require both close management and rehabilitation if the soil, water, and forage resources are to be adequately protected and the original productiveness is to be regained or enhanced. Some 22,000,000 acres are so situated and are of such character that the soil and moisture conditions are favorable to reseeding. The urgent need for revegetation and the possibilities of rapid rehabilitation of these lands warrant prompt consideration and treatment by Congress, similar to that proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 53 for range lands within the national forests. These 22,000,000 acres may be rehabilitated, it is estimated, at an average cost of \$5 per acre, or a total of \$110,000,000 over a 15-year period.

Comprehensive plans and studies are presently under way in the Department for a long-term program of revegetation and rehabilitation of the denuded range. When these plans, as well as the reforestation program, are formulated, they will be presented for the consideration of the Congress.

Since the committee has held a hearing on the Joint Resolution within the last few days and desires the views of this Department immediately, this report has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. I am, therefore, unable to advise you at this time concerning its relationship to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 53

[Report No. 733]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 12, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JUNE 6, 1949

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
and ordered to be printed

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

Whereas the national forests of the United States contain approximately eighty million acres of the Nation's commercial timberlands and approximately eighty-three million acres of the Nation's important grazing lands; and

Whereas these national-forest lands comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries, and good forest and other vegetative cover is essential for watershed protection; and

Whereas these lands annually supply approximately four billion board-feet of forest products through twenty-seven thousand sales transactions and the demand for national-forest timber is steadily increasing; and

Whereas these lands are the sole or main source of summer range

for ten million cattle and sheep grazed by thirty thousand livestock permittees whose livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon livestock grazed on national-forest ranges; and

Whereas these lands contain over four million acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and an additional four million acres of seriously depleted range lands; and

Whereas all of these lands are potentially capable of producing an important part of the timber and forage needs of local communities, and contributing to the protection of watersheds, thereby alleviating flood damage and insuring a continuing water supply, increasing opportunity for local employment, bringing greater stability to local communities, and increasing returns to counties in the national forests from their share of national forests receipts, together with other benefits; and

Whereas these lands will not restock or revegetate satisfactorily or within a reasonable time except through reforestation and revegetation or other measures to induce restocking or revegetation; and

Whereas it is practical to reforest these denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and revegetate these seriously depleted range lands in a period of fifteen years; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide reasonable continuity of reforestation and revegetation programs in order to insure effective, efficient, and economical operations: Therefore be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
 2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

1 That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate
2 and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation
3 and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands
4 under administration or control of the Forest Service of the
5 Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits
6 hereinbefore enumerated.

7 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
8 of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other
9 lands under the administration or control of the Forest
10 Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the
11 acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there
12 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available
13 until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000
14 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$5,000,000 for
15 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$7,000,000 for the
16 fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$8,000,000 for the fiscal
17 year ending June 30, 1954; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
18 ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent
19 year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and
20 thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation;
21 and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951;
22 \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952;
23 \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953;
24 \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954;
25 \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a

- 1 like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal
 2 year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts
 3 as may be needed for range revegetation.

Passed the Senate April 11, 1949.

Attest:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary.

Union Calendar No. 290

81ST CONGRESS
 1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 53

[Report No. 733]

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

APRIL 12, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JUNE 6, 1949

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 53

SEPTEMBER 27, 1949.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 369]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 369 report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

○

House Calendar No. 146

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 369

[Report No. 1345]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 27, 1949

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this
2 resolution it shall be in order to move that the House
3 resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on
4 the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint
5 resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation
6 and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national
7 forests, and for other purposes. That after general debate
8 which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue
9 not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled
10 by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Com-
11 mittee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for
12 amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion

1 of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment,
 2 the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the
 3 House with such amendments as may have been adopted
 4 and the previous question shall be considered as ordered
 5 on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final
 6 passage without intervening motion except one motion to
 7 recommit.

House Calendar No. 146

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 369

[Report No. 1345]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MADDEN

SEPTEMBER 27, 1949

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

ing high school graduates of this country. These classifications were not drafted to have a man with 4, 5, or 6 children to support come in at that lower grade. The high school graduate of 17 or 18 does not have any children to support. We want him in there in order to work up through these steps in this classification ladder.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, we are spoiling the career program by increasing those in the first grade. We are giving the starting employee more than we are giving anyone else all along the line. We are giving them an increase of \$350 which is more than anyone else in the service gets.

I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, the matter of striking out the two lower grades is a compromise at the present time. The original bill called for striking out the four lower grades. This is a realistic approach to the problem. To my way of thinking, striking out the two lower grades only goes half way, but, like the chairman, I am accepting this as a compromise measure so far as the will of the committee is concerned.

Now, this theory of having high school graduates enter the postal service sounds nice and looks good on paper, but it is not so good based on facts. The people who are being attracted to this type of work are men with families. The entering grades are very unrealistic today. They mean a take-home pay of less than \$35 a week to postal employees. I submit that is not very much.

I decry the fact, as does the gentleman who was an educator, that the average salary of high school teachers is so extremely low. I am happy to say that in my State it is not in that low category. I think he makes a very good argument for Federal aid to education and I shall support him on that when the time comes but that is not a proper matter to consider here. We are trying to do something for the underpaid postal workers, something to make their work more attractive to them.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I do not want the gentleman to think that I am making an argument for Federal aid to education, because I have argued against that proposition as a school man.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am very much surprised, I am somewhat chagrined to think that the gentleman is not realistic enough to appreciate that the only way he can help take care of the salaries of teachers in those States that are so impoverished they cannot do it any other way is through Federal aid. I am somewhat chagrined to think that my good friend, with whom I had the pleasure of serving on a committee, has taken such a very reactionary stand. But again we are not now debating that problem.

As I said, I think his argument is unrealistic. There is no relation between the salary of teachers and the salary of postal employees. We are trying to attract to this service people who will give an efficient performance, people who will be devoted to and interested in the service. That is the way it must be done. I sincerely hope that the gentleman's amendment is defeated.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I believe there is just one point that needs explaining regarding the elimination of the two lower grades.

There is pending before the Committee on Rules a bill, H. R. 87, which would provide for the elimination of up to the four lowest grades for veterans of the armed services who have entered the postal service. I believe, since we are trying to be realistic we may as well recognize that almost 100 percent of the new employees that have been hired since the war have been veterans. They have been, in many cases, veterans with families, and the starting grade was regarded as much too low to give them a proper standard of living. I cannot agree with the gentleman who served with such distinction on the committee that this is going to ruin the career program. It will simply mean that the employees would reach the top grade 2 years sooner and would start at a salary \$200 higher. So, therefore, in consideration of the fact that these new employees are mostly veterans, that the starting salary has been too low in relation to the incomes of other groups and that the request for the elimination of the two lowest grades is a mighty reasonable compromise, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take my 5 minutes, but I want to rise today to say that I am happy to support this bill, and I will go right down the line with it. I appeared before the committee, and I think they deserve a great deal of credit for the fine work they have done. I am glad to see that this postal pay raise bill is finally up here today so that we can all vote for it.

I am not going to inject a sour note into this debate. I am, however, going to point out the probability that since we will have passed this bill here today, there will be those who will come forward immediately and say that we have got to balance the budget and therefore

it is going to be necessary to raise the postal rates. In other words, they are going to attempt to raise the penny post card according to the information I get. They are going to try to double the penny post card to raise it to 2 cents, a thing which I think would be the most outrageous, diabolical thing that was ever put on the shoulders of the American people. It is just like a sales tax, whether you like it or not, or whether you like to admit it or not. It is making the poor man, in this instance, pay the tax that the rich man ought to assume. You are depriving the average citizen of sending a message out that he can do today for a penny, and he will have to do it for 2 cents if you double the cost of the penny post card.

I am not going to argue about the possible necessity, of raising certain classes of postal mail. I am saying here and now, just as I said on previous occasions, that it comes with poor grace on any future legislation, motion or measure that is brought on the floor of this House if this argument is used, "Well, we have raised the salaries of the postal employees. Let us saddle the American taxpayers by doubling the penny post card" and use that as a lame excuse. I do not think you can get away with it by doing this. We are going to raise the postal employees' salaries here today, a thing we should have done a long time ago. But, we have got to face the fact that there will be immediately a fight raised on the issue of attempting to balance the budget by doubling the penny post card. It is the only thing that the American rank and file have left to send messages at low cost. Let us give them that privilege and opportunity and not take a chance of bringing in future legislation to destroy that prerogative which they now enjoy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4495) to provide additional benefits for certain postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service with respect to annual and sick leave, longevity pay, and promotion, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 319, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 332, nays 2, not voting 97, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

YEAS—332

Abbitt	Colmer	Halleck
Abernethy	Combs	Hand
Addonizio	Cooper	Hardy
Albert	Corbett	Hare
Allen, Calif.	Cotton	Harris
Andersen,	Coudert	Harrison
H. Carl	Crook	Hart
Andresen,	Cunningham	Havener
August H.	Dague	Hays, Ark.
Andrews	Davenport	Hedrick
Angell	Davis, Ga.	Heffernan
Arends	Davis, Tenn.	Heller
Aspinall	Davis, Wis.	Herlong
Auchincloss	DeGraffenried	Herter
Bailey	Delaney	Heslerton
Barden	Denton	Hill
Barrett, Wyo.	D'Ewart	Hinshaw
Bates, Ky.	Dollinger	Hobbs
Bates, Mass.	Dolliver	Hoffman, Ill.
Battle	Dondero	Hollifield
Beall	Doughton	Holmes
Bennett, Fla.	Doyle	Hope
Bennett, Mich.	Durham	Howell
Bentsen	Eaton	Hull
Biemiller	Eberhart	Jackson, Calif.
Bishop	Elliott	Jackson, Wash.
Blackney	Ellsworth	Jacobs
Boggs, Del.	Engel, Mich.	James
Bolling	Evins	Javits
Bolton, Md.	Fallon	Jenison
Boykin	Fenton	Jenkins
Breen	Fernandez	Jennings
Brehm	Flisher	Jensen
Brown, Ga.	Fogarty	Johnson
Bryson	Forand	Jonas
Buchanan	Ford	Jones, Ala.
Buckley, Ill.	Frazier	Jones, Mo.
Burdick	Fugate	Jones, N. C.
Burke	Fulton	Judd
Burleson	Furcolo	Karst
Burton	Gamble	Karsten
Brynes, Wis.	Gary	Kearney
Camp	Gathings	Kearns
Canfield	Gavin	Keating
Cannon	Golden	Kee
Carlyle	Goodwin	Kelley
Carnahan	Gordon	Kennedy
Carroll	Gorski, Ill.	Kerr
Case, N. J.	Gorski, N. Y.	Kilburn
Case, S. Dak.	Gossett	Kilday
Cavalcante	Graham	King
Celler	Granahan	Kirwan
Chelf	Granger	Kruse
Chesney	Grant	Lane
Chipperfield	Gross	Lanham
Christopher	Hagen	Larcade
Chudoff	Hale	Latham
Church	Hall	LeFevre
Clemente	Edwin Arthur	Lemke
Clevenger	Hall	Lesinski
Cole, Kans.	Leonard W.	Lichtenwalter

Lind	O'Sullivan
Linehan	O'Toole
Lodge	Pace
Lucas	Passman
Lyle	Patman
Lynch	Patten
McCarthy	Patterson
McConnell	Perkins
McCormack	Peterson
McCulloch	Pfeifer,
McDonough	Joseph L.
McGrath	Pfeiffer,
McGregor	William L.
McGuire	Philbin
McKinnon	Phillips, Tenn.
Mack, Wash.	Pickett
Macy	Plumley
Madden	Polk
Magee	Potter
Mahon	Poulson
Marcantonio	Powell
Marsalis	Preston
Marshall	Price
Martin, Mass.	Priest
Mason	Quinn
Merrow	Rabaut
Meyer	Rankin
Michener	Redden
Miles	Rees
Miller, Calif.	Regan
Miller, Md.	Rhodes
Miller, Nebr.	Ribicoff
Mills	Rich
Mitchell	Rivers
Monroney	Rodino
Morgan	Rogers, Fla.
Morris	Rooney
Morrison	Roosevelt
Morton	Sadlak
Moulder	St. George
Murdock	Sanborn
Murray, Tenn.	Sasser
Murray, Wis.	Scott, Hardie
Nelson	Scrivner
Nicholson	Scudder
Nixon	Secret
Noland	Shafer
Norrell	Sheppard
O'Brien, Ill.	Sikes
O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
O'Hara, Minn.	Sims

NAYS—2

Hoffman, Mich.

Wheeler

NOT VOTING—97

Allen, Ill.	Engle, Calif.	Murphy
Allen, La.	Feighan	Norblad
Anderson, Calif.	Fellows	Norton
Baring	Flood	O'Konski
Barrett, Pa.	Garmatz	O'Neill
Beckworth	Gillette	Phillips, Calif.
Bland	Gilmer	Poage
Blatnik	Gore	Rains
Boggs, La.	Green	Ramsay
Bolton, Ohio	Gregory	Reed, Ill.
Bonner	Gwinn	Reed, N. Y.
Bosone	Harden	Richards
Bramblett	Harvey	Riehlman
Brooks	Hays, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoeven	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Horan	Scott
Burnside	Huber	Hugh D., Jr.
Byrne, N. Y.	Irving	Short
Chatham	Kean	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Cooley	Keogh	Steed
Cox	Klein	Tauriello
Crawford	Kunkel	Thomas, N. J.
Crosser	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Curtis	Lovre	Vinson
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Walter
Dawson	McMillen, Ill.	Willis
Deane	McSweeney	Wilson, Tex.
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Wolcott
Donohue	Mansfield	Woodhouse
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Worley
Elston	Multer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Huber with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Lovre.
Mr. Tauriello with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Bramblett.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Phillips of California.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Rains with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Short.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Richards with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Green with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION OF FOREST AND RANGE LANDS OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 369, Rept. No. 1345), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AID TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 368, Rept. No. 1344), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5330) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided

and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I received unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a manuscript entitled "Harnessing the Wind for Electric Power." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$205, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. McGRATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DELETION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to delete from the permanent RECORD a statement which was made when the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] yielded to me a few days ago. I have received his consent; he has no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to exceed two pages of the RECORD at a cost of \$184.50.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, sometimes when I feel indisposed or disinclined to do any thinking of my own I get a copy of the Washington Post or the Washington Sunday Star, and I can always learn there what the Star and the Post think I ought to do.

So that some of you may not anticipate and get too far ahead of yourselves, I call your attention to the fact that the Sunday Star which I hold in my hand, and which carries the date line of October 2, 1949, carries the date line a little too soon. I know we are moving pretty rapidly, but I do not think October 2 has rolled around yet. I just call that to your attention to show you that sometimes even the Star may be mistaken about what it thinks.

However, that is not what I want to talk about. What I want to talk about is to ask if there is anyone here in the House—and I am not addressing my remarks to the Speaker or to the Democratic leadership, because I am satisfied they do not have any accurate information—who knows when we are going to finish our session and adjourn. If there is, I would like to be advised. To my mind, we are just wasting our time.

I noticed a cartoon the other day in one of the papers that depicted the Speaker talking to a Member of the other body, the leader over there. I think I may mention his name without having my attention called to the rule. It was Senator LUCAS. He was telling him that if he wanted to know how to end the session of the Senate, perhaps the Speaker should do it. If anyone on the majority side has any influence with the Speaker, and if you succeed in learning when we are going to adjourn, will you tell me, please, because I want to plan my hunting trip?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness in her family.

To Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. McGRATH), for an indefinite period, on account of important business.

To Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. McGRATH), for an indefinite period, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5356. An act to provide for the conveyance of land to the Norfolk County Trust Co., in Stoughton, Mass.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the

President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1976. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 3616. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lulu Two Spears Iron Bird;

H. R. 3886. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jeanette Pearl Burns;

H. R. 5310. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of California over the lands and residents of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in said State, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5670. An act authorizing transfer of land to the county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, for a hospital site.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 28, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

949. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an administrative expense authorization of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the fiscal year 1950, together with an amended budget program (H. Doc. No. 339); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

950. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Annual Report of the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to Public Law 560, Eightieth Congress (providing for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes, for the period July 1, 1948, through June 30, 1949); to the Committee on Armed Services.

951. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the agricultural experiment stations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

952. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a volume containing the acts of the ninth special session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, December 20 to 21, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

953. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee of conference. S. 2115. An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3419. A bill to amend the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1342). Re-

ferred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5872. A bill to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest in the State of Nevada; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 368. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5330, a bill to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 369. Resolution for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 53, joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KEE: Committee of conference. H. R. 5895. A bill to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3605. A bill to provide for the documentation of the Canadian-built vessel *North Wind* owned by a citizen of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 6230. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to school district No. 5, Linn County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6231. A bill to authorize the construction of a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Otter Slough, Douglas County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 6232. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Corona Naval Hospital at Corona, Calif., to the Veterans' Administration and for the operation and maintenance of such hospital as a hospital facility for veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 6233. A bill to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 6234. A bill to establish the Arizona Desert National Park, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 6235. A bill to provide an accelerated program for surveying and mapping of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6236. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the armed forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 6237. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Human Rights in the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 6238. A bill to authorize the appointment of guards, watchmen, or other protective personnel of Federal agencies as special policemen, prescribing their powers as such, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANAHAHAN:

H. R. 6239. A bill relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 6240. A bill to authorize the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 6241. A bill to authorize the return of Mexican flags captured during the war with Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 6242. A bill to prevent the entry of certain giant snails into the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. J. Res. 356. Joint resolution to authorize the President to lend to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations funds for the construction and furnishing of a permanent headquarters, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 357. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. J. Res. 360. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILES:

H. J. Res. 361. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. Res. 366. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of the government of organizations dealing with labor; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 367. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 6243. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Kostas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 6244. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shizuko Yamane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6245. A bill for the relief of Anthony Stavrinides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 6246. A bill for the relief of Bror Rainer Heikel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 6247. A bill authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 6248. A bill for the relief of Manuel Nogueira Alves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 6249. A bill for the relief of Fernando Do Carmo Vincente Ferreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6250. A bill for the relief of Johanna A. Stoots; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1508. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors, Kenosha County, Wis., petitioning the Congress to amend the present social security laws and regulations in order that Federal reimbursement for persons residing in county homes for the aged may be immediately forthcoming; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1509. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Norberto Somera, Vigan, Province of Ilocos Sur, Republic of the Philippines, relative to his claim arising out of his maltreatment while a prisoner of war of the Imperial Japanese Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

New Deal and the Fair Deal have so confused the people, so long taken them down the broad and easy road which, in nations, leads to national bankruptcy and the loss of the individual's liberty, that the inherent honesty of the American people has become so impaired that they look with too great a degree of tolerance upon the President's use of his high office and public funds to strengthen and further his own political ambition.

Permit me to again cite his current activities which prove he has either no conception of the responsibility, or no intention of carrying out the duties, imposed upon him as the chief law-enforcing executive officer.

From the daily press we learn that we are threatened with strikes which may injuriously affect the public welfare. We are on the verge of Nation-wide coal and steel strikes, of strikes in the motor industry. A railroad strike is on, and there are almost innumerable threats of strikes throughout the land.

Organized labor claims that it elected Harry S. Truman and to date, so far as I know, he has not denied that statement.

Labor's top officials are welcomed at the White House. They threaten strikes which will cause Nation-wide unemployment and throw upon the public the burden of aiding in the support of hundreds of thousands of unemployed, unless their demands for an increase in compensations and pensions to be paid for by the employer, in the end by the consumer taxpayer, are granted.

In return for their support at the last election, these union leaders now insist that they are entitled to the support of the President and the executive Federal departments controlled by him in their dispute with the steel industry—and they are getting it.

Instead of assuming and carrying out the duty imposed upon him of using the law of the land—the Taft-Hartley Act—which he promised to enforce, in an effort to reconcile the dispute between employees and employers, the President, to please his political supporters, by-passing the Taft-Hartley Act, appointed a fact-finding board which was without power or authority to hand down a decision—a decision that was not binding upon anyone.

The purpose was to secure public support for the President's political adviser and supporter, Phil Murray.

The President expressly stated that the findings of that board would not be binding upon either party. His statement was accepted at its face value by both labor and industry. But the union officials now, without repudiation by the President, are insisting that the board's finding on the matter of pensions be accepted as the basis for negotiation.

Thus we find that the President, of all people, is lined up with Phil Murray and the motor industry's union representatives. He is putting the heat on industry to grant pensions to the members of the unions, to be paid for in the first instance by the employer, but ultimately by not only the consumer of certain products but by everyone.

Make no mistake about the accuracy of that statement. Even though you do not buy a pound of coal or an automobile, the price of everything you eat, wear, or use is increased to some extent by the cost of every increase in wages, salary, or pension.

The President is using the power of the Federal Government to obtain and hold the support of certain groups of organized labor. The cost of his program to purchase labor support through the granting of special privileges you will pay.

The President is assisting the CIO and certain other unions to establish a labor government. If once organized labor is established here, we as a people will lose our liberty and our freedom, just as the people of England have lost their freedom. And our Government, like the English Government, will be dependent upon other nations for the welfare of its people. Unfortunately, unlike England, there is no other nation, no Uncle Sam, no Santa Claus, to whom we might turn in our distress.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5884) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from North Carolina explain the bill? There is a unanimous report on the bill, there is no objection on our side.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill is necessary because at the time the original Atomic Energy Act was passed the Air Corps was not constituted by law. The Vandenberg amendment created the liaison committee between the military and the Commission. At the present time the Air Corps is charged with the mission of carrying out atomic attack and should have representation on this committee. This amendment gives them authority to place a man on the committee.

The bill also gives the President optional authority to appoint a military man if he cares to do so. At the present time the head of the liaison committee is a civilian, but under this amendment the President can appoint either military personnel or a civilian to be chairman of the liaison committee. The amendment was reported unanimously from the Joint Atomic Committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Military Liaison Committee: There shall be a military liaison committee consisting of a chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and of a representative or representatives of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, detailed or assigned thereto, without additional compensation, in such number as the Secretary of Defense may determine. Representatives from each of the three Departments shall be designated by the respective Secretaries of the Army, Navy,

and Air Force. The Committee Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at a rate prescribed by law for the Chairman of the Munitions Board. The Commission shall advise and consult with the Committee on all atomic energy matters which the Committee deems to relate to military applications, including the development, manufacture, use, and storage of bombs, the allocation of fissionable material for military research, and the control of information relating to the manufacture or utilization of atomic weapons. The Commission shall keep the Committee fully informed of all such matters before it and the Committee shall keep the Commission fully informed of all atomic energy activities of the Department of Defense. The Committee shall have authority to make written recommendations to the Commission on matters relating to military applications from time to time as it may deem appropriate. If the Committee at any time concludes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act of the Commission on such matters is adverse to the responsibilities of the Department of Defense, derived from the Constitution, laws, and treaties, the committee may refer such action, proposed action, or failure to act to the Secretary of Defense. If the Secretary concurs, he may refer the matter to the President, whose decision shall be final."

SEC. 2. Section 2 (d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "Army, or the Navy" and inserting in lieu thereof, "Army, Navy, or Air Force".

SEC. 3. Section 2 (d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is also amended by inserting at the end thereof the following two sentences: "Likewise, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, any active or retired officer of the Army, Navy, or Air Force may serve as Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee established by subsection (c) of this section, without prejudice to his commissioned status as such officer. Any such officer serving as Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee shall receive, in addition to his pay from the United States as such officer, an amount equal to the difference between such pay and the compensation prescribed in subsection (c) of this section."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2372) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Military Liaison Committee: There shall be a Military Liaison Committee consisting of a chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and of a representative or representatives of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, detailed or assigned thereto, without additional compensation, in such number as the Secretary of Defense may determine. Representatives from each of the three Departments shall be designated by the respective Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The committee chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at a rate pre-

scribed by law for the Chairman of the Munitions Board. The Commission shall advise and consult with the committee on all atomic-energy matters which the committee deems to relate to military applications, including the development, manufacture, use and storage of bombs, the allocation of fissionable material for military research, and the control of information relating to the manufacture or utilization of atomic weapons. The Commission shall keep the committee fully informed of all such matters before it and the committee shall keep the Commission fully informed of all atomic energy activities of the Department of Defense. The committee shall have authority to make written recommendations to the Commission on matters relating to military applications from time to time as it may deem appropriate. If the committee at any time concludes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act of the Commission on such matters is adverse to the responsibilities of the Department of Defense, derived from the Constitution, laws, and treaties, the committee may refer such action, proposed action, or failure to act to the Secretary of Defense. If the Secretary concurs, he may refer the matter to the President, whose decision shall be final."

SEC. 2. Section 2 (d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "Army or the Navy" and inserting in lieu thereof, "Army, Navy, or Air Force."

SEC. 3. Section 2 (d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is also amended by inserting at the end thereof the following two sentences: "Likewise, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, any active or retired officer of the Army, Navy, or Air Force may serve as chairman of the Military Liaison Committee established by subsection (c) of this section, without prejudice to his commissioned status as such officer. Any such officer serving as chairman of the Military Liaison Committee shall receive, in addition to his pay from the United States as such officer, an amount equal to the difference between such pay and the compensation prescribed in subsection (c) of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next, October 3, 1949, for 30 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next, October 3, 1949, for 15 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next, October 3, 1949, for 40 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, roll call No. 204 shows that I was not present and voting. I was present and voted "nay" on an amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. BROWN of Ohio before the Pennsylvania Medical Society.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from an address by Mr. Thomas Robertson.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Col. Patrick Miller, formerly consultant to General Robertson of the British Military Government in Berlin in reference to the dismantling of German plants.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include a short article from a newspaper.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay by George J. Chryssikos entitled "Thomas Jefferson," notwithstanding that it exceeded two pages of the RECORD, and, according to the Public Printer, cost \$195 to print.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LIND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from statements heretofore made by him and from publications.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by William C. Doherty made before a subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND (at the request of Mr. SHEPPARD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the late Richard J. Welch.

REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION OF THE FOREST AND RANGE LANDS OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I call up House Resolution 369 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill which this resolution makes in order comes before us from the Committee on Agriculture with a unanimous vote of all the members of that committee. It provides for a reforestation and revegetation program for our national forests. There are approximately 80,000,000 acres of commercial timberland in our national forests, and about 4,000,000 acres of this timberland is submarginal and nonproductive. This condition is caused by reason of forest fires and lack of care on the part of previous owners of this land. The Forestry Department has had over 40 years' experience in rehabilitating submarginal lands. This resolution, with the bill that follows, will authorize a program wherein the Government can launch on a 15-year program to make productive approximately 4,000,000 acres of fertile, but at the present time, submarginal land in our forest reserves.

This bill also provides for reestablishing into a productive state about 4,000,000 acres of grazing land in our national forests. It is estimated that it will take about 2 or 3 years to restore this unproductive grazing land, and after these 4,000,000 acres are restored, it is estimated that there will be approximately 5 to 10 times the present food production from this acreage.

If rehabilitation of these areas were left to nature, it would take generations before this valuable grazing land could be restored, and consequently the country would be deprived of the production from this land in the shape of meats, grains, vegetables, and what not. At the present time the Government is expending approximately \$1,300,000,000 in rehabilitating our forest lands, and about \$800,000,000 in revegetation of our range lands. Reforestation and revegetation is not a new policy, but in reality it has been going on for some time. It has been almost 50 years ago, under President Teddy Roosevelt's administration, that

it began. One of the pioneers in reforestation was Gifford Pinchot, one of Teddy Roosevelt's Cabinet Members. The program authorized by this resolution will be the first major effort on the part of our Government to reforest, revegetate, and reclaim on a major scale.

I do not think there is any opposition to the rule and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, President Truman may be convinced that he owes a political debt to certain labor-union monopolists. But no political debt—real or imaginary—to any minority pressure group should be paid at the expense of the American people as a whole.

The current strike in the coal industry is rapidly producing a critical shortage of coal. It is beginning to affect every segment of our national economy. Within a few weeks the available stock piles of coal will be exhausted. As winter sets in millions of our people will be without coal to heat their homes. Having no coal to ship, the railroads and the truckers are already laying off employees, and here and there throughout the country, where the shortage is already acute, plants are beginning to shut down.

This approaching crisis, with all the hardship and suffering it involves for millions of innocent people, can be avoided. There is a remedy. I appeal to the President to invoke immediately the national-emergency provisions of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act in the current coal strike.

In this appeal I believe I am expressing the sentiment of the majority of the Members of Congress, and I have today introduced a concurrent resolution to express formally this opinion to the President.

By using the machinery provided by the Taft-Hartley Act for such emergencies as this, where our national health and safety are imperiled, the President can obtain the continued production of coal for at least a period of 80 days. Within that time there will be opportunity to obtain a peaceful settlement of this dispute.

If President Truman does not use the authority vested in him by law to secure a continued production of coal until a peaceful settlement of the dispute is reached, he must bear the responsibility for the millions of homes that will be without coal this winter, and he must bear the responsibility for the widespread unemployment that is rapidly growing as the wheels of industry stop turning because of the lack of fuel. He must also bear the responsibility for the

killings and bloodshed that are daily taking place in the coal-mining areas.

As of September 1, the Bureau of Mines estimated that we had stock piles of 65,000,000 tons of coal. This was 4,000,000 tons less than was stock-piled as of August 1.

The country normally consumes around 40,000,000 tons a month. With production rapidly declining, it can be readily seen that in a few weeks the country will be without coal. Within a few weeks our homes will be without heat. Within a few weeks our whole national economy will come practically to a standstill.

All this can be avoided if the President will but exercise the authority vested in him. I consider it his duty to do so.

For reasons of his own, he may not like the Taft-Hartley Act. The labor-union monopolists may not like it. But it is the law of the land. On three definite occasions we, who represent the people, voted for the law. We voted twice to put it on the statute books, and we voted this year to keep it on the books.

It provides a remedy for this critical situation. I appeal to the President to use it, and I ask the House to pass the resolution I have today introduced memorializing him to use this authority we have given him.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. For several years under the Marshall plan and the relief plans we have been shipping a lot of coal to England and other countries. I understand that if this strike is prolonged in the United States it is the plan to let the British ship coal into this country and get American dollars for it under the devalued pound. The English people will supply the coal, and our miners will be thrown out of work.

(Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

REPUBLICANS' SIOUX CITY FARM MEETING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was heartening to read in the press recently that the Republican leaders were having a meeting in Sioux City for the purpose of agreeing on a good farm program. I kept up with the proceedings the best I could through the daily press. I am sorry their efforts resulted in a miserable failure.

BRANNAN PLAN

We have a program that I believe is a good one. I am personally for the Brannan plan. If our Republican friends can get up a better plan, possibly we would adopt it. I am anxious to consider any program that will aid agriculture

and keep our country in a prosperous condition.

We all know that without the farmers being prosperous the Nation cannot be prosperous. It is absolutely compulsory that we have good farm prices and good wages in order to have prosperity in our Nation. We cannot pay this huge national debt of more than \$250,000,000,000 unless we have a high national income. There is only one way to have a high national income, and that is through good farm prices and good wages.

President Truman has asked for a national income of \$300,000,000,000 by 1953. I hope we are able to attain that objective. If we are successful in reaching an annual national income of \$300,000,000,000, that will increase our tax revenue by \$15,000,000,000 a year under present rates. I mean under present rates we will have that much additional revenue. But the time has come when the Republican Party must either take the responsibility for antifarmer cooperative measures sponsored by some of its Members in Congress, or they must repudiate these efforts of insurgent within their own ranks to destroy the effectiveness of farmer cooperatives in their efforts to maintain a stable and healthy agriculture.

John H. Davis, who is executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, was invited to attend and make a statement at the Sioux City meeting. Mr. Davis pointed out to that meeting, and I am quoting what he said:

Farmers have become concerned over the antifarmer cooperative bills and activities of certain Republican Congressmen and Senators whose activities and bills apparently have been condoned by the leadership of the party.

There is a prominent leader stating to the Republican leaders that they believe the opposition to the farmer cooperatives is condoned by the leadership of their party, that is, by the leadership in the Republican Party. Mr. Davis laid it on the line in regard to Republican efforts to hamstring farmer cooperatives. He told the GOP leaders that farmers have a right to know just where the Republican Party stands in regard to this matter. Personally, I agree with Mr. Davis. I think our Republican friends should answer Mr. Davis. I did not see anything about his statement in the press at all and I have not seen any answer given by the leaders of the Republican Party. I believe the time has come in the interest of good farm legislation for the Republican leaders to speak out and say whether or not they are behind the movement to destroy farmer cooperatives or whether they are against that movement. I hope that a good farm bill will be agreed upon by the Republicans. Then we can put these plans side by side and use the deadly parallel and can determine which plan is best. I certainly hope they do not go along and just criticize the bills proposed by our administration and not propose any farm legislation themselves, since farm legislation is vital.

ACHE AND HOPE

During our last Republican administration under President Hoover, the farmers struggled. They ached; they pained. But they had hopes. They had hope in the future that they would have better times and better prices, and that they would be able to get along much better. So they just ached and hoped. Now I trust that our Republican friends do not compel us to rely upon the Aiken-Hope bill as the only salvation for the farmers of the country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly interested in the resolution now before the House being Senate Joint Resolution No. 53 and wholeheartedly favor its adoption. It provides for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests. This subject is close to my heart because of my State and because of the interest shown by many people in my district on this very subject. In the early days of the Republic, the Library of Congress informs me, we had some 822,000,000 acres of forest lands. About 600,000,000 acres still remain, but most of it is denuded of forests. What is needed, as I see this problem, is that the Congress should consider in the near future a program of Federal and State cooperation to augment or supplement what is intended to be done by this resolution now before the House.

One of the things badly needed, especially in Michigan, and I am sure it applies to other Midwestern and Eastern States, is the question of providing seedlings or young trees in cooperation with State organizations, to plant or replant these acres of denuded forest lands. Out of some 16,000,000 acres of cut-over lands, on which nothing is growing now, nearly 20 percent of it is within the State of Michigan.

Minnesota has done a great deal, in this field and some of the other Midwestern States as well. I would like to give to the House some of the figures given to me by the Legislative Reference Service of Congressional Library on this very subject. It advises me that out of some 1,600,000,000 board-feet of lumber still remaining in this country, we are depleting it at the rate of about 18,500,000,000 board-feet of lumber every year. In other words, it does not take very much of a mathematician to figure out if that rate continues the time is not far distant when the lumber resources of the United States will have been completely exhausted.

One thing that can be done to augment or supplement what we are trying to do by this program, is to encourage, through the States, and civic organizations in cooperation with the Federal Government, the replanting of many millions of these acres on which nothing remains now except rotting pine stumps, as in the State of Michigan.

I believe there are many civic organizations that would be interested and happy to lend assistance and take over the replanting of acres of this land as

a privilege and civic duty, if given an opportunity to do so. I believe sportsmen's organizations are greatly interested from the standpoint of conservation, recreation, and reforestation of the cut-over lands. In my home county of Oakland, the second largest county in Michigan in population, there is one organization of some 8,000 sportsmen. It is called the Oakland County Sportsmen's Association. The director or manager of that organization, Mr. Ray Harrington, has discussed this matter with me and is doing something in the field of conservation to provide reforestation in Michigan. He is an enthusiastic friend and advocate of this type of program. What applies to my State applies to every State in the Union where they have had forests.

I think much can be done if we would carry out such a suggestion. In my State the thing that is needed most is seedlings and seeds so these organizations might assist in replanting the thousands of acres upon which nothing exists but which are now barren wastes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman kindly repeat the number of board feet available, and the exhaustion each year, as I am deeply interested in it.

Mr. DONDERO. The figures furnished me by the Congressional Library are 1,600,000,000 board-feet which is being depleted at the rate of 18,500,000,000 board-feet annually.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has expired.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], in the same objectives that he has laid before the House today. The gentleman made mention of the State of Minnesota, which I have the honor, in part, to represent in this House.

I served 6 years in the State legislature, and I have some knowledge of this problem as it occurred during the thirties.

Those of you who have had the opportunity to travel over the beautiful State of Minnesota probably have seen the wasteland in the northern section of our State. The timber barons in the early days had almost completely stripped the northern part of the State of lumber, leaving the stumps as monuments to that stripping. Many people, because of the beauty of the country and the wonderful lakes, felt they could buy some of that denuded land and make a livelihood on it.

During the depression years of the thirties, thousands and thousands of the so-called former forest land, what we call the bog lands, reverted to the State because it was impossible to grow a thing. Even vegetables will not grow on many thousands of these acres. The only thing that will grow is trees of the type indigenous to the area. That is the only

thing that can be planted or replanted to bring an income to the people of that part of the State.

The State of Minnesota in the last 4 years has initiated a program along this line, but with the large mass of this bog land and with the great need for reforestation it is a bigger job than the State of Minnesota itself can handle. This Congress will contribute greatly to the income not only of the State of Minnesota but also to the Nation as a whole by bringing back the forests through the replanting of these thousands and thousands of acres.

Many of our school districts were affected by this disintegration of the land from individual ownership to State ownership because land was the only thing from which they could get cash for their districts. Since the land has reverted to the State they have lost this source of income and it has become necessary for the State of Minnesota to supplement their revenues. Reforestation can bring back the value of this vast area. We are all interested in the problem, but it is too great for the State of Minnesota to handle by itself.

I know all Members here were and are deeply concerned with the shelter belt program of reforestation that was started a number of years ago, to extend from Texas to the Canadian line. I have great hopes that that project will succeed.

I ask your efforts in support of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for the time allotted to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the importance of the bill before the House, but I wanted to speak for these few minutes on a subject that I am vitally interested in.

IRELAND IS ENTITLED TO A FULL AMBASSADOR
FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the recent discussion about the lack of an Ambassador from the United States to the Republic of Ireland by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT]. I have long been interested in this matter and only hope that the State Department will take note of what has been said on the floor of this House and very promptly remedy the situation.

No nation has proven a better friend to the United States through the centuries than has Ireland. This is being emphasized today in all of our discussions about the Marshall plan in Europe, where Ireland has frequently taken the lead in trying to bring about an effective application of the principles for which the Marshall plan stands. Ireland has taken the forefront in urging increased production in Europe together with increased multilateral trading, which is most important.

Contrary to the British view of increasing dollar earnings and reducing dollar purchasing, Mr. MacBride, Minister for External Affairs in Ireland, has advocated a closer method of planning and cooperation between European countries and the United States, Australia, and Canada, in order that excess production anywhere may find proper distribution and beneficial consumption. The British program will but lead to underconsumption, reduced employment, and finally an economic collapse.

Despite the leadership assumed by Ireland in the European problems, a leadership which has been directly aligned with the program of our own State Department and the ECA, nevertheless Ireland appears to be completely ignored by the State Department. The lack of proper representation, by way of an Ambassador, is but one of the things which does not seem to concern our diplomatic officials.

Irish affairs in the State Department have always been combined with the British desk, instead of being given their proper recognition as a distinct unit to be handled separately. Irish affairs and Irish economic reports and problems should be entitled to separate handling and direct control, rather than being confused with British matters.

As for the matter of partition, the State Department has consistently refused to so much as consider the matter. The fact that partition has existed in Ireland for less than 30 years, that it is a very recent innovation, seems not to concern our diplomats. Yet the problems of Indonesia, Pakistan and other countries always receive a very prompt and attentive ear, as well as a loud voice crying out in their behalf from our State Department.

Certainly it is no more right for Great Britain to continue her imperialistic control of the six counties of Northern Ireland, than it is for Holland to attempt to continue her domination of Indonesia by force of arms, regardless of the wishes of the people of that country. So it is with Ireland, where the majority of the population of the country overwhelmingly desire a united Ireland under one government free from outside control of any sort. And it is the people of the whole country who alone have the right to make this decision.

There are those who contend that a small minority in the north of Ireland should not be compelled to join with the people of the south. On the contrary it is the right of the majority of the people in any democratic system, who have the right to determine the method and system of government. Naturally the rights of the minority must be protected

against any unlawful restraints, as has been done in the constitution which has been established as the law of the land in Ireland. Throughout the 26 counties, oppression and unjust restraint have been forever eliminated as far as minorities are concerned so long as the constitution is enforced and respected, as it has been since its adoption.

The same situation does not exist in the northern six counties, where oppression of an existing minority group there is too well known to require comment by me. Suffice it to say that at long last the Belfast government has seen fit to repeal many of the tyrannical provisions of the Special Powers Act which has been on their statute books since the creation of this so-called nation. Not only have those provisions been on the statute books, but they have been put into practice all too frequently. With their repeal, I trust that it will bring to an end the power to imprison one without charge, to hold a prisoner thus indefinitely without trial, and to deny the writ of habeas corpus.

There is no better time than now for our State Department to assume the position of leadership, which is theirs, and to carry into effect the wishes that have been expressed by so many on this floor. Now is an appropriate time for the United States to raise the status of our representative in Ireland to that of Ambassador, and in so doing likewise to make representations to Great Britain that we desire that they bring to an end the unjust partition of Ireland. The two can well go hand in hand, and I trust that we may soon witness a united Ireland, taking her rightful place among the nations of the world, a friendly Ireland, who has so often aided our cause and championed our freedom loving principles.

(Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present to the House a story written by headlines in the press of our Capital City within the last several days.

First. "Senate votes to cut funds already appreciated for stock piling by \$275,000,000."

Second. "President reports atomic explosion in Russia."

Third. "Nation's Capital still without plans for meeting A-bomb attack."

Fourth. "Senate votes \$3,000,000 for big birthday celebration in Washington next year."

The President and our Commander in Chief does not like the idea of the Senate slashing our stock-piling program at this time. Nor do I. If we ruin our stock pile now there may be no birthday parties tomorrow.

Congressional inquiry will establish that sufficient funds for the birthday party have already been pledged. Twice the House has rejected this hand-out. I am sure it will do so again.

If we are going to use stock-piling funds for other purposes, I can think of many more appealing than the Senate has in mind.

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three instances and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

(Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am intensely interested in reforestation. I have planted 277,750 trees on my plantation since 1941. I can tell you more ways how not to plant trees than any man in Michigan.

I want to take this time to speak about some of the things that are being done along the line of reforestation. The Manistee National Forest is located in my district. We are now beginning to see the results of the planting of thousands and thousands of trees by the CCC in that area. That organization did a magnificent job. We will soon be harvesting some of those trees in the way of posts and smaller timbers.

Several weeks ago I had the privilege of attending the tenth anniversary of the Ottawa County, Mich., soil conservation district, which, I am told, was the first district to be organized in America. Dr. Bennett, Chief of the United States Soil Conservation, attended that meeting.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] was also there. That group of farmers in that little county planted more than 14,000,000 trees during those 10 years. I wish you could have gone with us inspecting those trees. We saw Norway pine growing there 10 feet high on what was formerly barren sand-drift lands.

Adjacent to this district is the South Muskegon, Mich., soil conservation district. That district has also done a wonderful job. They have planted millions of trees in areas which were very barren. The land that had gone back to the State for taxes today is at a premium. It is now back upon the tax rolls and is paying its part of the burden of State government.

They have in those two districts some of the finest nurseries I have ever seen.

The South Muskegon Conservation District has the older nursery. I have yet to find trees, Mr. Speaker, grown by the national forests or the State forests or the State conservation departments that compare with the trees grown by the South Muskegon Soil Conservation district in that little county in Michigan. They have run-off plants; they have

everything there that goes to make up a wonderful District. Ottawa County Soil Conservation District has 1,350 co-operators. If that kind of work could be done in the other 3,000 counties in the United States, it would be a wonderful step forward in soil conservation and reforestation in America.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has not done its part toward furnishing funds for reforestation. This money for reforestation is coming back; there is no question about that. I was raised in northern Michigan. I worked in the lumber camps in my boyhood days. I saw the last of the pine go and the first of the hardwood come into production. My father sold maple logs, the finest in the country, 3½ feet through, for \$3.50 a 1,000 board feet, delivered at the mill. I have watched the forest fires denude the areas and burn up the slash and destroy the soil underneath it that had accumulated for centuries. These areas should be and must be reforested.

I want to say a word for Dr. Bennett, Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Department. Dr. Bennett has done and is doing a splendid job all over America. His name will go down in American history as the father of soil conservation. He is making a real contribution toward soil conservation and reforestation in America.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I wish to join in the statement of the gentleman from Michigan in complimenting the West Ottawa Soil Conservation District as well as the South Muskegon County Soil Conservation District. I also want to say that the people in that particular area of Michigan are deeply indebted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] for his untiring efforts to achieve success along those lines.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forests and rangelands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 53, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Chairman, this joint resolution was passed by the Senate and came to the House and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. It was unanimously reported by that committee. It was considered by a subcommittee of which the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] was the chairman. I am sure the joint resolution was thoroughly considered and is a meritorious piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the RECORD at the conclusion of the legislative program of today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to take much time this afternoon. It is certainly gratifying to know there are so many people in the country who are becoming conservation-minded and especially interested in the revegetation of our forest lands.

The greatest natural resource in all the world, the greatest natural resource of man, is grass, and akin to that is our forests. Grass does not only furnish food and fiber for the sustenance of human existence, but it is the bulwark against erosion and against floods. Some day we will become conscious of the necessity of spending more money on our lands, to plant grass and trees which will lessen the necessity of spending great amounts of money for flood control. The same is true of our national forests.

The tree is one of the greatest assets of humanity. We do not think of it in that light, perhaps, but it furnishes more labor and brings more comforts to humanity than nearly any other thing that grows in the soil. This being true, we, as a people, have been negligent and have done very little both as individuals and as communities to preserve this great heritage. That is what this legislation is for, as the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO and Mr. ENGEL] so ably pointed out. It is to formulate a program which we have not had before. We have had hit-and-miss programs and hit-and-miss appropriations. But this legislation contemplates a long-range, well-thought-out program for the planting of trees and grass.

It was only forty-odd years ago that we became conscious that we had to preserve these resources. We brought into existence at that time the National Forest Service which had for its purpose the protection of these great resources. As a Congress and as individuals we have done very little and have spent very little money to replant trees and to plant grass, seeming to assume they were indestructible. Now we are finding out the fallacy of this assumption. The time is here when we can no longer swing the double-edged ax and cut down the trees

and denude our forests without replanting the trees.

This bill is simply an authorization to spend over a period of years about \$13,000,000 for the next 15 years in a concerted effort to revegetate our forests and our range lands.

I hope the committee will see fit to give this resolution their unqualified support.

We have before us now the Senate resolution. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] had an identical bill which the committee had under consideration. We considered the bill, as the chairman of our committee has said, very carefully. It was unanimously passed by the subcommittee of which I am chairman and unanimously passed by the great Committee on Agriculture. It is a bill which has for its purpose the revegetation of public lands—lands that belong to all the people of the country.

I might say in answer to a question raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], when he said that we ought to do something more by way of State cooperation. We do have such a bill which has to do with cooperation between the States and Federal Government and which has to do entirely with private forests. There is a sufficient amount of money authorized in that bill, which was passed by this body, to afford adequate fire protection, and for the production and planting of seedling trees. We are in hopes that the bill will be passed by the other body and finally become the law of the land.

Our committee, during this session, I believe, has considered more forestry legislation than we have in many years. I think the people are conscious that we need soil conservation and conservation of our range lands and our forest lands. I believe we can justify the authorization of this program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact, to the end that the Members may be advised, that House Joint Resolution 167, to which the gentleman referred was introduced by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on February 16, quite some time before the bill was introduced in the other body. Both of those measures were before the House committee. Consideration was given to them and we reported the Senate resolution for the reason that the Senate resolution had already been passed by the other body. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. GRANGER. That is true, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Further, the bill which we now have before us, being unanimously reported, would in all probability have passed on the Consent Calendar, but for the amount of money involved?

Mr. GRANGER. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. There is one thing I believe may be of interest to the House and which I omitted to mention. The Eastern and the Middle Western States

contain three-quarters of the forest lands of the Nation with only one-quarter or one-third of the lumber resources of the Nation. That indicates to what extent the forest lands have been denuded in at least two-thirds of the country.

Mr. GRANGER. I think that is true. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] may follow my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, Senate Joint Resolution 53 was introduced in the Senate by Senator ANDERSON and passed unanimously. It is identical with House Joint Resolution 167 which I introduced in the House.

This is a very important measure, because, after all, the Forest Service is the guardian of much of our natural resources, and if we do not do something along the lines of reforestation and revegetation, this property which is held in trust for the people of the United States is going to become more and more worthless. On the other hand, if we authorize this measure and the funds are forthcoming, it will mean that practically worthless property today will become of increasing value as the years go on.

Eighty million acres of the Nation's commercial timberlands and 83,000,000 acres of the Nation's important grazing lands are found in the national forests. These timberlands annually supply 4,000,000,000 feet of forest products through 27,000 sales transactions, and the demand for national forest timber is increasing steadily. These grazing lands are the sole or main source of summer range for 10,000,000 cattle and sheep grazed by 30,000 livestock permittees whose livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon a continuing supply of range forage. Many communities are dependent on the utilization of these national forest resources.

These same lands also comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries.

The national forests contain a substantial acreage of timberland that is either denuded or badly understocked. Some of this acreage will come back naturally to desirable tree growth, but over 4,000,000 acres of the commercial timberlands must be reforested artificially if the potential capacity of the lands is to be utilized for the production of forest products. This land is widely distributed. There is a sizable job of reforestation in north Idaho and western Montana in the extensive old burns. Even larger areas of land acquired after clear-cutting and burning are still in need of replanting in the Lake States. The Pacific Northwest, California, and the Southern States are other regions where

extensive reforestation is needed on the national forests.

The continued heavy demand for lumber and other timber products continues and is resulting in a terrific drain upon our forest resources. We should take every measure feasibly within our means to keep our commercial timberlands in a continuous productive condition.

Four million acres of these range and watershed lands are in a seriously depleted condition from the standpoint of both soil stability and forage production. In their present condition, they are producing nowhere near the amount of forage they should. Moreover, serious erosion hazards that in some cases affect entire communities are being created. Beyond question, there is immediate and pressing need for a program designed to check the present downward trend in both soils and vegetation and to restore the depleted areas to maximum productivity.

Range and watershed rehabilitation can be accomplished in many cases by drastic reductions in livestock use—in some cases remove all livestock—and wait for nature to go about the task in her own way. Her way, as we all know, is long and laborious. In some areas, decades will be required to do the job if nature is left to her own devices. And even then the results would fall far short of what could be accomplished by other means. Such procedure would obviously be insufficient, wasteful, and unconstructive. Moreover, it would defeat the very worthwhile objective of doing everything possible to provide additional forage for livestock.

Though there is no way of avoiding substantial reductions in livestock numbers in many national forest ranges for protection of watersheds and the range itself, the need for reduction can be reduced through a plan-wise program of revegetation. There is no longer the slightest doubt about the practicability of such an undertaking. The Forest Service has already demonstrated that many depleted range and watershed areas can be restored to production within 2 or 3 years and made to support from 5 to 10 times the number of livestock now carried.

Our flood-control activities, the building of all of these reservoirs for the generation of power or for flood control or the improvement of navigation, or greatly extending our irrigated areas, are all affected by the condition of the mountain watersheds from which the major portion of the water flow comes. So that, from the standpoint of watershed treatment alone in the western part of the country, a much more rapid reforestation coverage and revegetation program would be a fine investment as a corollary to these other very extensive undertakings in which the Government is now engaged.

Up to the present time, the Forest Service is enabled to plant about 35,000 acres a year, and a little arithmetic will show, with 4,000,000 acres to plant, that it would take well over 100 years to do the job. On the revegetation end, with the money which is now provided, they can plant between 75,000 and 100,000 acres a year with range reseeding, so that it will

take in the neighborhood of 40 to 50 years. So it is obvious that under our present financing of programs we will move ahead very, very slowly.

The revegetation undertaking is self-liquidating in that, according to experience so far, it will return at least 5 percent interest on the investment and in many cases, over a reasonable period of time, will retire the investment in range reseeding, because it greatly increases, of course, the carrying capacity of the national forest land which is reseeded, and that means a much larger revenue from a given area of national forest land arising from the permittee use by domestic livestock.

The major part of the reforestation and revegetation job can be accomplished in 15 years. A program of this size and duration, if carried through without interruption, will result in the cheapest and most efficient manner of handling this job. This work must be done eventually. Continued postponement of the job will result in the work being more costly and the benefits further delayed into the distant future. This joint resolution would place Congress on record as recognizing the need for an accelerated program of reforestation, range and watershed revegetation. It would also authorize appropriation of the funds needed to carry out such a program.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this resolution, having at one time served as a member of the Forestry Service on a national forest just north of Yellowstone Park. I know the need for this reforestation and revegetation.

Montana has a number of national forests and they support and extensive timber industry and provide summer range for a large number of cattle and sheep. Reseeding of the ranges where that is necessary and reforestation has been carried on in my State for a number of years both on federally owned lands and on private. The reseeding has been very successful in restoring ranges that have been destroyed or depleted either by overuse or by the plow. We know that this work can be successfully undertaken in our State and that the results will more than repay the money spent in this kind of work. It is hoped that reseeding will provide an answer on ranges where cuts in livestock numbers have been found necessary so that it will not be longer necessary to reduce numbers. We know that tree planting is the quickest answer to burned over timber areas.

I believe this legislation is in the Nations interest and as such should receive the approval of this House.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a meritorious bill that should be passed in the interest of the

general economy of the country. When we look into the future we know how vital our lumber and timber resources are to the country as a whole.

Mr. Chairman. I asked for 5 minutes of this time to speak somewhat about farm legislation, but I was hoping the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] would be present, because I wanted to direct my remarks to him. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said he favored the Brannan bill, but since he has left the Chamber, I will withhold my remarks at this time until he can be present, so that I may have the privilege of discussing the Brannan bill that he desires.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is much controversy in the House where forestry legislation is concerned. I believe that this body fully recognizes the importance of sound forestry practices. The bill that is now before us will implement and advance sound forestry in this country, and I heartily support it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, sometimes I wonder whether Wisconsin is one of the States of the Union or whether it is going to be treated as a stepchild or a poor relative. I am more and more impressed with the advance of my State when I realize, day after day, just like this piece of legislation, that Wisconsin has been one of the leaders, as far as this phase of American agriculture is concerned. Over 20 years ago the leadership was taken by the paper-mill people. As you probably know, Wisconsin is dotted with some of the most splendid paper and pulp mills which you can find anywhere in the country. They had foresight and they acquired a lot of this cheap land and went ahead and planted hundreds of acres of trees many years ago.

The Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, even the last legislature, provided, as I remember, that the taxes will not be over 20 cents an acre on the land that has been reforested. There must be provisions for fencing it, and that has been one of the reasons why the program has not advanced any faster than it has. Of course, during the war it could not advance. There is not any doubt in the mind of anyone who knows anything about the lumber industry, about the tremendous wealth which any township or county or State can acquire by having a stand of merchantable timber. When you realize that even on the stump you can get \$50 an acre for it standing, for many classes of timber, it is some indication of the possibility as far as financial returns are concerned. There is, however, another consideration that is cropping up. I am calling your attention to it because it is in the works; it will come over in due course and we will take it up

at an early date. It happens to deal with Christmas trees. It is in the works and will be taken up in a few days. You can pass it. I do not know how we could stop it, but we stopped it last year under unanimous consent. But there is a Christmas tree business that is really of advantage to the United States. Thousands and thousands of trees are being brought into Chicago from Michigan, and into Detroit, and they are making quite a business of Christmas trees. According to law you are not supposed to cut your trees as immature as they must be for Christmas trees, for the price they bring on the first sale does not nearly compensate for the loss of growth. But there is a large Christmas tree market and a large Christmas tree business, and, as I say, this bill will soon be before us dealing with the general welfare of the people and the Christmas tree business.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was under the impression that certain people in Dutchess County, N. Y., said they could produce enough Christmas trees to take care of the needs of the country. The gentleman is familiar with that great project up there, I am sure.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Well, we were raising trees a long while before we heard about Dutchess County, N. Y.; as a matter of fact, we had been raising them for many years before that. But the Christmas-tree business is becoming a business as much as farming, although there does not happen to be any of it to speak of in my district. Naturally there is a possibility, but I do not think it will happen, of going into the Christmas-tree business in connection with this reforestation. Many people are doing it, and many people are looking forward to taking this legitimate profit from the Christmas-tree business. But I take it for granted that under this bill the objective is not going to be the Christmas-tree business. The objective is going to be the reforestation of this land with the type of timber adapted to the land and for the general welfare of the whole United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I realize that there is not much controversy as far as the passage of this well-considered bill is concerned. This bill was passed by the other body without a dissenting vote. It was considered by the Committee on Agriculture of the House, of which I am a member, and there were no dissenting votes against same; it passed the committee unanimously. From what Members on both sides of the aisle have said heretofore, I am sure no one will disagree with this bill in any particular. It is the first bill to be considered by the Eighty-first Congress which has the unanimous approval of every Member of the House. It provides for extensive reforestation and the planting of areas to grass. It is a great measure as far as preventing erosion by wind is concerned and erosion by water.

It is hard for one to realize that in the ages past all of the hills fringing both banks of every main river in the North, West, and Middle West areas were made by wind erosion. Particles of earth swept across the country by winds became soaked with moisture as they passed over rivers and fell again to earth on the opposite side of the river they passed over. Maurice Kirby, a geologist for the Army engineers, some years ago demonstrated to me that certain soils on the south side of the Platte River in Nebraska came from Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, and that certain soils on the east bank of the Missouri River came from Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, and other western points, and that certain soil on the west bank of the Missouri River came from Illinois and other Eastern States. These soil deposits were carried by the prevailing winds of ages ago and even up to today. Near a schoolhouse at Missouri Valley, Iowa, he demonstrated that a portion of that soil came from Loveland, Colo. The soil samples were identical. Wind erosion is not new to the United States of America. The Dust Bowl is as old as creation itself. Progressive thinking and legislation like that which we are now considering will stop soil erosion by wind. Present-day civilization will cure an old ill by tree and grass planting.

In view of the fact that there is not any partisan contention here today which has to be met, I wish to make a literary contribution of a great man to this body by reading one of the finest articles on grass which, in my opinion, was ever written. It was penned by that master juggler of words, the great, truly Republican Senator from Kansas, John J. Ingalls. I wish to read copiously from the excellent speech which he made upon the subject Blue Grass:

BLUE GRASS

Attracted by the bland softness of an afternoon in my primeval winter in Kansas, I rode southward through the dense forest that then covered the bluffs of the north fork of Wildcat. The ground was sodden with the ooze of melting snow. The dripping trees were as motionless as granite. The last year's leaves, tenacious lingerers, loath to leave the scene of their brief bravery, adhered to the gray boughs like fragile bronze. There were no visible indications of life, but the broad, wintry landscape was flooded with that indescribable splendor that never was on sea or shore—a purple and silken softness, that half veiled, half disclosed the alien horizon, the vast curves of the remote river, the transient architecture of the clouds, and filled the responsive soul with a vague tumult of emotions, pensive and pathetic, in which regret and hope contended for the mastery. The dead and silent globe, with all its hidden kingdoms, seemed swimming like a bubble, suspended in an ethereal solution of amethyst and silver, compounded of the exhaling whiteness of the snow, the descending glory of the sky. A tropical atmosphere brooded upon an arctic scene, creating the strange spectacle of summer in winter, June in January, peculiar to Kansas, which unseen cannot be imagined, but once seen can never be forgotten. A sudden descent into the sheltered valley revealed an unexpected crescent of dazzling verdure, glittering like a meadow in early spring, unreal as an incantation, surprising as the sea to the soldiers of Xenophon as they stood upon the shore and shouted, "Thalatta." It was blue grass, un-

known in Eden, the final triumph of nature, reserved to compensate her favorite offspring in the new paradise of Kansas for the loss of the old upon the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates.

Next in importance to the divine profusion of water, light, and air, those three great physical facts which render existence possible, may be reckoned the university beneficence of grass. Exaggerated by tropical heats and vapors to the gigantic cane congested with its saccharine secretion, or dwarfed by polar rigors to the fibrous hair of northern solitudes, embracing between these extremes the maize with its resolute pennons, the rice plant of southern swamps, the wheat, rye, barley, oats, and other cereals, no less than the humbler verdure of hillside, pasture, and prairie in the Temperate Zone, grass is the most widely distributed of all vegetable beings, and is at once the type of our life and the emblem of our mortality. Lying in the sunshine among the buttercups and dandelions of May, scarcely higher in intelligence than the minute tenants of that mimic wilderness, our earliest recollections are of grass; and when the fitful fever is ended, and the foolish wrangle of the market and forum is closed, grass heals over the scar which our descent into the bosom of the earth has made, and the carpet of the infant becomes the blanket of the dead.

As he reflected upon the brevity of human life, grass has been the favorite symbol of the moralist, the chosen theme of the philosopher. "All flesh is grass," said the prophet; "My days are as the grass," sighed the troubled patriarch; and the pensive Nebuchadnezzar, in his penitential mood, exceeded even these, and, as the sacred historian informs us, did eat grass like an ox.

Grass is the forgiveness of Nature—her constant benediction. Fields trampled with battle, saturated with blood, torn with the ruts of cannon, grow green again with grass, and carnage is forgotten. Streets abandoned by traffic become grass-grown like rural lanes, and are obliterated. Forests decay, harvests perish, flowers vanish, but grass is immortal. Beleaguered by the sullen hosts of winter, it withdraws into the impregnable fortress of its subterranean vitality, and emerges upon the first solicitation of spring. Sown by the winds, by wandering birds, propagated by the subtle horticulture of the elements which are its ministers and servants, it softens the rude outline of the world. Its tenacious fibers hold the earth in its place, and prevent its soluble components from washing into the wasting sea. It invades the solitude of deserts, climbs the inaccessible slopes and forbidding pinnacles of mountains, modifies climates, and determines the history, character, and destiny of nations. Unobtrusive and patient, it has immortal vigor and aggression. Banished from the thoroughfare and the field, it abides its time to return, and when vigilance is relaxed, or the dynasty has perished, it silently resumes the throne from which it has been expelled, but which it never abdicates. It bears no blazonry of bloom to charm the senses with fragrance or splendor, but its homely hue is more enchanting than the lily or the rose. It yields no fruit in earth or air, and yet should its harvest fail for a single year, famine would depopulate the world.

One grass differs from another grass in glory. One is vulgar and another patrician. There are grades in its vegetable nobility. Some varieties are useful. Some are beautiful. Others combine utility and ornament. The sour, reedy herbage of swamps is base-born. Timothy is a valuable servant. Redtop and clover are a degree higher in the social scale. But the king of them all with genuine blood royal, is bluegrass. Why it is called blue, save that it is most vividly and intensely green, is inexplicable; but had its unknown priest baptized it with all the hues of the prism, he would not have changed its

hereditary title to imperial superiority over all its humbler kin.

Taine, in his incomparable history of English literature, has well said that the body of man in every country is deeply rooted in the soil of nature. He might properly have declared that men were wholly rooted in the soil, and the character of nations, like that of forests, tubers, and grains, is entirely determined by the climate and soil in which they germinate. Dogmas grow like potatoes. Creeds and carrots, catechisms and cabbages, tenets and turnips, religion and rutabagas, governments and grasses, all depend upon the dew point and the thermal range. Give the philosopher a handful of soil, the mean annual temperature and rainfall, and his analysis would enable him to predict with absolute certainty the characteristics of the nation.

* * * * *

The primary form of food is grass. Grass feeds the ox; the ox nourishes man; man dies and goes to grass again; and so the tide of life, with everlasting repetition, in continuous circles, moves endlessly on and upward, and in more senses than one, all flesh is grass. But all flesh is not blue grass. If it were, the devil's occupation would be gone.

There is a portion of Kentucky known as the bluegrass region and it is safe to say that it has been the arena of the most magnificent intellectual and physical development that has been witnessed among men or animals upon the American continent, or perhaps upon the whole face of the world. In corroboration of this belief, it is necessary only to mention Henry Clay, the orator, and the horse Lexington, both peerless, electric, immortal. The ennobling love of the horse has extended to all other races of animals. Incomparable herds of high-bred cattle graze the tranquil pastures; their elevating protoplasm supplying a finer force to human passion, brain, and will. Hog artists devote their genius to shortening the snouts and swelling the hams of their grunting brethren. The reflex of this solicitude appears in the muscular, athletic vigor of the men, and the voluptuous beauty of the women who inhabit this favored land. Palaces, temples, forests, peaceful institutions, social order, spring like exhalations from the congenial soil.

All these marvels are attributable as directly to the potential influence of blue grass as day and night to the revolution of the earth. Eradicate it, substitute for it the scrawny herbage of impoverished barrens, and in a single generation man and beast would alike degenerate into a common decay.

I will not burden the House further by reading all of this splendid speech but wish to recommend to the Members of this body that they read same in toto at their own leisure, because I believe it gives you a true appreciation of what a great part grass now plays and has always played in the history not only of this Nation, but in the history of all the nations of the world.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the objectives of this legislation which provides for reforestation and revegetation of our national forests and range lands. I also wish to thank the committee in charge of this bill for accepting my amendment to keep shelter belts in another measure. These tree plantings, I wish to report, are doing very well and are appreciated all over the Plains States.

This kind of Plains States forestation should be expanded.

Regarding this legislation one need only to fly over the national parks and the country of the Pacific Northwest to learn that this legislation is badly needed. To give importance to land in general, I include in my remarks an excellent editorial printed in the Portland Oregonian:

EUROPEAN PEASANTRY BEHIND RISE OF TITOISM

One who flies from Portland across the United States, over the Atlantic and on into Europe—in comparatively clear weather so that the pattern of land and sea is visible—has a soul-shaking experience.

One achieves, from the land forms below, a new realization of what it means to be an American—to be a citizen of a country which came late upon the world scene and which developed itself on the basis of stubbornly idealistic and democratic principles. First there are the infinite vistas of our western side of the continent. The Cascades raise their isolated peaks; the great wheat ranches of the inland empire pass below; the plateaus and cases of Idaho lift toward the Continental Divide; then there is the coasting down over the Great Plains to the flats and rolling hills of the Middle West. And all this time—half way across North America—there seem to be no habits of development, and especially of agriculture, that confine the human spirit. The fences run every which way, and on heroic scale. This is the West as history has left it to us, and it is very real—very important in the psychology of the Nation and the world.

Then in the Middle West one encounters the division of the land into quarter sections. Beneath the plane are the generous squares and oblongs of the agriculture resulting from the homestead period—and as matters have turned out these divisions have been remarkably efficient. * * * On over Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, where the pattern gradually dissolves, where the fields become smaller and less regular in size, yet still adequate. One seems to be moving back into history as the fields below diminish. Yet even on the east coast, back of Washington, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, where truck gardens press close in their eagerness to supply these metropolitan centers, there remains something of American expansiveness. The constructions on the east coast are informative but not sufficient to prepare one for Europe.

Suppose one flies into Europe over Britain—the peninsula which France extends farthest into the sea. Here are the little hedgerow-guarded fields which cost so many American lives in 1944. These little fields—drifting below the traveler's plane—are shocking in their age and in their implacability. They existed in the Middle Ages; so it is this way now.

One goes on over France, over Germany, over Czechoslovakia, over Austria, down above Italy.

Below, always, are the "plots" so alien to American thinking. In our country we excitedly allotted the greater part of a continent in accordance with the pressures and our thinking at the time; in Europe they have these small ancient divisions of the land based upon conditions now long since extinct. So we have the difference between the European peasant and the American farmer.

What we do not understand over here is that a single furrow in Europe can be an international incident. They do not understand us; we do not understand them. They note every blade of grass along the roadside and bring an animal to eat it. No American has ever thought of a single blade of grass.

So it is most difficult for Americans to appreciate that much of what is taking

place in Europe results from a problem which we have never even recognized.

Our agriculture has been free to conform to the techniques of the new day. European agriculture has had no such freedom. The land was divided and subdivided centuries ago, and the population then multiplied to the maximum the land would bear under hoe-and-shovel operation. If tractors were introduced, where would the people go? This is the difference between peasantry and farming.

Actually, this dilemma of outworn methods in a modern world dominates the thinking of much of Europe, and especially of such Russian satellites as Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Poland, operating beyond the industrialized centers of the continent. The production per rural resident is about seven times as great in modernized Denmark as in Rumania, Bulgaria, or Poland, and five times as great as in Hungary. Here are millions and millions of people attached to an overworked soil, and unable to relinquish the soil to modernization because they have no place to turn.

Much of the Russian appeal to these countries has been based upon the idea of industrialization. The Communist agents have promised that capital would be provided for factories, power plants, and rolling mills. The peoples no longer would live in rural serfdom. The populations could be drained off into industry, with its higher standards of living. And this in turn would raise the rural standards.

Such was the promise, and since it was accompanied by military force, there wasn't much to do but dream the best dreams possible. Especially since faraway America—the only power capable of competing with Russia—was constitutionally incapable of understanding the desperation of the peasant situation. That is what took place, with very little noting in the United States.

Now, however, Tito has led Yugoslavia into revolt against Russian pressure, and examination of Tito's purposes is leading to a general study of the problem of central and eastern Europe.

The reality seems to be that Yugoslavia, which was tentatively a satellite country, shared the promises of industrialization with the other states, and Russia failed to make good. So Tito, who is quite an individualist, and his people, who are probably, per capita, the toughest on earth, struck off for themselves and to invite help from the west. (Yugoslavia has a greater variety of resources than the other states named. It is reported that industrialization is getting under way there, despite Russia, with a notable influx of peasants and hill people to the cities.)

Meanwhile, the discovery that Tito is economically disappointed rather than ideologically outraged, has led students to attempt to determine whether Russia has done better with her more pliant satellites.

Apparently not, so far as one can penetrate behind the iron curtain. There is no evidence that she has been willing to spare from her own economy any capital with which to keep the promises of industrialization which she made when she extended her controls over Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. And Czechoslovakia—already industrialized when Russia took over—she is ruthlessly draining.

However, it is not enough that Russia has failed and probably will fail—that Yugoslavia is in revolt and that the closer satellites might be ready for revolt if they had the opportunity.

The problem on which Russia really based her western thrust—and which we in America did not understand—is still unsolved. Beneath the plane the little plots of ground are unaltered, with men hoeing and women leading individual animals to individual blades of grass. It is only in Yugoslavia there seems to be the hoped-for industrial

ferment, and that is only through a combination of independence and appeal to the west.

What, specifically, is the answer to the Balkans and associated areas? Here live many of the world's most creative and uncontrollable people under intolerable conditions. The blue Danube forever runs red.

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily supporting this legislation as I have been working in this direction for the more than a dozen years I have been a Member of this body. In no part of this great country can grass and trees be appreciated more than in the State from which I come. We know their commercial value, their economic value, and their esthetic value as well. We appreciate their lack or their loss and are all the more anxious to restore them.

Of all the valuable books furnished by the Department of Agriculture as year books, I think the last two stand among those at the top. The year book for 1948 is entitled "Grass," and the year book for 1949 is entitled "Trees." Of course, each contains a world of information and scientific knowledge gained in the past and each points the way for a greater and more prosperous future. This legislation to promote progress in developing these two basic natural resources of vegetation and forests, with which other basic resources are so intimately mingled, will give meaning to those books and, what is far more important, will help to give substantial foundation to our natural wealth and national economy.

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much gratified that this measure is receiving such splendid support. It is not an involved question or one that requires lengthy explanation. It is a very important measure, however, one of the most important conservation measures, I will say, that has come or will come before this Congress.

In this legislation we are dealing with the property of all the people of the United States—our national forests. The money we will put into those forests under this legislation in the way of reforestation and revegetation will be put in on an investment basis, an investment that will pay liberal returns not only in the way of conservation and watershed protection but in an increase in the carrying capacity of our ranges and in the yield of timber in the years to come.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this legislation. I think it is a great investment to reseed the land with both timber and grass, so that we may have both timber and range,

Idaho is 72 percent federally owned. My State of Idaho will reap great benefits from this measure, as will the people as a whole, in the production of wool, meat, and timber. This is a very constructive measure, and it has my full support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the national forests of the United States contain approximately 80,000,000 acres of the Nation's commercial timberlands and approximately 83,000,000 acres of the Nation's important grazing lands; and

Whereas these national-forest lands comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries, and good forest and other vegetative cover is essential for watershed protection; and

Whereas these lands annually supply approximately 4,000,000,000 board-feet of forest products through 27,000 sales transactions and the demand for national-forest timber is steadily increasing; and

Whereas these lands are the sole or main source of summer range for 10,000,000 cattle and sheep grazed by 30,000 livestock permittees whose livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon livestock grazed on national-forest ranges; and

Whereas these lands contain over 4,000,000 acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and an additional 4,000,000 acres of seriously depleted range lands; and

Whereas all of these lands are potentially capable of producing an important part of the timber and forage needs of local communities, and contributing to the protection of watersheds, thereby alleviating flood damage and insuring a continuing water supply, increasing opportunity for local employment, bringing greater stability to local communities, and increasing returns to counties in the national forests from their share of national forests receipts, together with other benefits; and

Whereas these lands will not restock or revegetate satisfactorily or within a reasonable time except through reforestation and revegetation or other measures to induce restocking or revegetation; and

Whereas it is practical to reforest these denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and revegetate these seriously depleted range lands in a period of 15 years; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide reasonable continuity of reforestation and revegetation programs in order to insure effective, efficient, and economical operations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands under administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits hereinbefore enumerated.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other lands under the administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation; and \$1,500,000 for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for range revegetation.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution. Over 400,000,000 acres in the 11 Western States belong to the United States. Some 80,000,000 acres under the control and dominion of the Forest Service is presently used for grazing. The Forest Service has made drastic cuts in the permitted numbers of livestock running on the forest ranges of the West during the past 30 years. The stockmen using the forests during the summertime are obliged to provide range and feed elsewhere for the balance of the year. As a result of these reductions, countless stockmen have found it impossible to carry on their operations economically and have been obliged to go out of business. This program is long-past overdue. It is estimated that it will take at least 15 years to complete it. It should have been instituted a quarter of a century ago. I have repeatedly urged additional appropriations for reseeding and revegetation of these national forest lands. A year ago, I offered an amendment on the floor of the House to increase the appropriation for reseeding by \$250,000. That amendment was adopted. I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that appropriations pursuant to this authorization will be provided so that a systematic program can be carried out to revegetate the 4,000,000 acres of forest lands that are unproductive for one reason or another at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, over a year ago, our Committee on Public Lands made an exhaustive study of the grazing use of the forest lands and as a result thereof, issued its report unanimously recommending:

First. That the Forest Act be amended to provide that grazing, recreation, and wildlife be made basic uses of national forest lands.

Second. That advisory boards on the national forest be given legal status.

Third. That the present policy of transfer cuts be discontinued, and that any cuts that may be necessary be made for protection purposes only.

Fourth. That the Forest Service undertake a vigorous program of range improvement including (a) water development, (b) reseeding, (c) fencing, and (d) rodent and poisonous weed control.

Fifth. That the Forest Service undertake a policy that will enable the permittees to participate in and contribute to a greatly extended range-improvement program.

Strange as it may seem, the basic law establishing the national forest reserves and authorizing the administration of these lands by the Forest Service fails to provide for grazing as one of the basic uses of these lands. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that along with this legisla-

tion, Congress should provide for many other badly needed range improvements. A constructive program should be evolved for the intelligent utilization of the grass resources of our western forests so that the livestock industry will be encouraged to produce more rather than less. The fences on our national forests are in a deplorable condition. Adequate appropriations for fencing should be made so that the Forest Service might effect better management of their lands by means of rotation grazing. There should be additional appropriations for widespread development of water resources so that the forage a considerable distance from running water can be harvested and gathered by livestock.

The appropriations for rodent control and predators is wholly inadequate. If the forest ranges of the West are improved along these lines and if legislation is enacted establishing forest advisory boards and defining their duties and writing into the law regulations governing range improvements and the determination of grazing fees, and providing for public hearings on proposed rules and regulations for the administration of grazing, then, Mr. Chairman, we would be a long way on the road to a proper solution of the present controversy involving these matters. It would bring about a government by law rather than government by men in this field, and in the long run, such a procedure would prove far more satisfactory to both the Forest Service and the people of the West.

Mr. Chairman, without a question of a doubt, this is a step in the right direction. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation should bring a new era to the administration of our national forest lands. In order to more easily accomplish the objectives of this legislation and to bring other much needed improvements on our forest ranges, the United States Forest Service should make every possible effort to obtain the cooperation of all of the people using those lands. A constructive program providing for basic legislation for the grazing use of the forest lands and definite laws for the administration of these lands will assuredly prove to be in the interest of all the people.

(Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have ever seen gentlemen on the floor of this House in as complete agreement as they are today. I am very glad of that fact. I do not believe I have been in the House when everyone seemed to be in a better humor. That is another thing I am glad about. For once we seem to be agreed that we have a piece of legislation that should be adopted.

I also am in complete agreement with that legislation.

I have always loved the grass and the trees and the soil. During the recess of this House I stood behind a glass and ran a terrace line on a 50-acre field out in Missouri that needed to have its face lifted. Before I left home and came

back here about 70 percent of the work of lifting the face of that field was completed.

Soil conservation is like the itch. You catch it. Once you get it, it is hard to get rid of. I am glad of that. I do not think we should get rid of it.

Men have loved the soil and have given lip-service to soil conservation for years. I am glad that this House today is ready to give something more than lip-service to the conservation of our soil and our acres of forest resources. Our soil is a heritage that was given us by our forefathers. The prime reason we are the most prosperous Nation in the world today is because we have a greater acreage of fertile soil for the population than any nation in the world. The Department of Agriculture says we have 3½ acres of good farm land for every man, woman, and child in the United States. I mean tillable land; not the kind of land that needs reforestation, but good farm land. We ought to conserve it. We also ought to save and conserve our forest lands and our forest resources.

If I have not forgotten it, I should like to repeat to the gentlemen of this House a little poem that I learned in my youth. For fear that I would put it somewhere where I could not find it, I think I have it committed to memory, and I will attempt to give it to you today for whatever it may be worth:

My father was a mountaineer,
His fist was a knotty hammer,
He was fleet on his feet as a running deer,
And he spoke with a Yankee stammer.

My mother, she was merry and brave,
And thus she came to her labor;
A pine tree tall was her doctor grave,
And a tumbling stream was her neighbor.

Now some are wrapped in beds of silk
And down like a godling's scion,
But I was cradled on bows of pine
In the skin of a mountain lion.

And some are born 'neath lucky stars,
But never a boy more lucky,
For I cut my teeth on "money musk"
In the bloody ground of Kentucky.

When I grew tall as the Indian corn
My father had little to lend me—
Just a bullet mold and a powder horn
And a woodman's skill to defend me.

I lost my boyhood when I found my wife—
A girl like a Salem clipper,
She stood as straight as a hunting knife,
And her eyes were bright as the dipper.

We sowed our sons on the wagon trails,
A fruitful and goodly muster;
Our oldest fell at the Alamo,
Our baby died with Custer.

The letter that told it burned my hand,
But I sighed and said, "So be it";
But I couldn't live when they plowed the sod;
It broke my heart to see it.

I saddled a red unbroken colt
And rode him into the day there,
And he threw me down like a thunderbolt
And rolled on me as I lay there.

I heard the hunter's whistle blow
As they tried in vain to rouse me,
And I died in my boots like a pioneer,
And the buffalo graze around me.

Now my youth comes back like the rains in
spring,
And my sons like the wild geese flying,
And I sleep at peace in my prairie soil,
And I am quite content in dying.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 53 to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 369, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAIR DEAL FRAME UP—RESULT OF CIO STEEL DISPUTE IS VITAL

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is a fateful hour for the American people.

The events of the next several days on the steel-labor front may well decide the kind of a future they are to enjoy—or endure.

They very easily could lose their freedom and become regimented robots in a welfare state, under a Fascist labor government.

Such a calamity is possible because only a mere handful of our people regard the situation as being that serious; because only a few are alert to the dangers which beset our free institutions.

To most, it appears to be simply a question as to whether the steel companies can be induced to accept the recommendations of the President's "fact finders," or will Mr. Philip Murray and his steelworkers call a strike.

After all, the American people have faced, and have survived, many hundreds of serious strikes in the past.

In view of this it may be difficult for some to believe that so simple a circumstance as the issues behind a threatening steel strike should be so pregnant with grave consequences to our country and its people. Yet, a fair consideration of the facts which surround this situation will convince the most confirmed skeptic that very dangerous developments can result from the "findings" of the so-called fact-finding board.

FACT-FINDING BOARD BIASED—FINDINGS DECEPTIVE

The amazing thing is that, although the board's decisions settled nothing, and even precipitated a serious crisis, little, if anything, has been said by way of criticism concerning the obvious bias of the board and its lopsided, reckless recommendations.

Instead, President Truman declares: "The recommendations of the Board have been accorded widespread acclaim and approval as a statesmanlike formula for fair and equitable settlement of the disputes in the steel industry."

If this were true, there would have been a quick settlement, and there would have been no need for the President to intervene for a third time to stave off the strike dead line.

The alleged "widespread acclaim and approval" of the board's recommendations is greatly exaggerated. The President was merely parroting Mr. Murray, who had the gall to declare that "public opinion" approved of the board's decision, and therefore, the steel companies would have to surrender unconditionally before Mr. Murray would trouble himself to send emissaries to talk about a new contract.

Fortunately, the steel companies refused to be intimidated; and so Mr. Truman had to inject himself into the situation again to "save face" for Mr. Murray.

The President's evasion of the Taft-Hartley law, his appointment of an extralegal fact-finding board, the character of his appointees to that board, the tricky way in which the board maneuvered to give Mr. Murray all that he wanted, and, at the same time, wrote a record that implied a contrary decision, and an apparent concern for the welfare of the companies and the country, the timely interventions by the President, and the arrogant and overbearing attitude of Mr. Murray throughout the whole situation, suggests connivance, conspiracy.

On the basis of the supporting evidence, this combination of circumstances has all the earmarks of a Fair Deal frame-up.

The fact is, the American people have been witnessing, from expensive front row seats, one of the slickest pieces of a dramatic stage play ever presented to divert an anxious audience. There was to have been a happy ending, but something went wrong with the plot; and now the action is building up to a tragic climax—a crippling steel strike, which, if it comes, will wreak havoc in hundreds of related industries, and which, together with the current coal strike, could disrupt our economy completely, bring on a depression, wreck the world recovery program, and insure the success of communism in Europe and Fascist statism in the United States.

The report of the so-called fact-finding board was a clever piece of work. It fairly oozed apparent fairness, reasonableness, sweetness and light, and suggested compromise, get-together, talk-it-over, but behind all this, hedged in with legalistic loopholes was the mischievous recommendation for an industry-wide noncontributory pension—a most revolutionary departure from the established and traditional American policy of self-reliance and private initiative under our free-enterprise system.

The "fact finders" recommended this noncontributory pension in spite of the fact that they say in their report: "The board is scarcely in a position after this concentrated hearing to say precisely what should be done on pensions."

In the matter of pensions and welfare insurance the board urged collective bargaining, not now, but after an intensive study, and yet it recommended a 10-cent per-hour commitment by the companies before any study had been made. And they did this after declaring in their report to the President: "No one can state with certainty what they (the companies) can afford now. Much depends on future conditions."

PHONY FACT FINDING

Taken as a whole, it was phony fact-finding—a biased report in favor of the union. It was nothing more nor less than a go-ahead signal for camouflaged "fourth round" demands on industry generally—a circumstance which threatens the economic stability of the Nation.

Spokesmen for the steel companies already have explained that they cannot fully accept the board's recommendations regarding pensions. They contend, for one thing, that it would be economically impossible to absorb the stupendous costs without passing them on to the consuming public in higher prices, which, in turn, would result in a sharp decline in sales, and bring mass unemployment and depression.

It was a "smooth" report, replete with double talk. It said, for instance, that "the subject of pensions is not bargainable at this time," and it declared, also, that "the subject of pensions is bargainable under the law." In fact, the report was so carefully and cleverly phrased that most people missed its true significance, which was the big idea. The way in which the board used astute truisms to emphasize economic fundamentals as applied to the steel industry and to the country—and then proceeded to ignore them in its recommendations—was positively ingenious.

For example, the board correctly declared that a wage raise in steel probably would be urged as a pattern to be followed in other industries for a "fourth round" increase, and that "this in turn might well cause price dislocations, with adverse effects on the general economy and on the steel industry itself." How true!

Yet the board recommended pensions and social insurance at a cost amounting to almost 90 percent of the wage raise demand.

THE TAXPAYING CONSUMER PAYS

No matter what the award is called—pensions or pay hikes—the increased costs to industry will have the same effect on the Nation's economy. Higher wages or higher wage costs, what is the difference? The taxpaying consumer pays.

If, as the President's board recommended, the full cost of pensions and social insurance is to be imposed upon employers in steel, it is true also that this probably will be the pattern forced upon the rest of American industry. David Dubinsky, head of the huge International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, already has announced that company-financed pension funds will be demanded in all future contracts. And the electrical workers are demanding a \$500 "package."

Will not all this cause "price dislocations, with adverse effects on the general economy," which the board's report declared would be the result of an almost equal wage increase? Of course it will.

It will add \$3 per ton to the price of steel, with similar price increases in other industries all along the line, or it will mean bankruptcy for most of the smaller, and many medium-sized companies.

[PUBLIC LAW 348—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 674—1ST SESSION]

[S. J. Res. 53]

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes.

Whereas the national forests of the United States contain approximately eighty million acres of the Nation's commercial timber lands and approximately eighty-three million acres of the Nation's important grazing lands; and

Whereas these national-forest lands comprise the principal source of water supply for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes for thousands of communities, farms, and industries, and good forest and other vegetative cover is essential for watershed protection; and

Whereas these lands annually supply approximately four billion board-feet of forest products through twenty-seven thousand sales transactions and the demand for national forest timber is steadily increasing; and

Whereas these lands are the sole or main source of summer range for ten million cattle and sheep grazed by thirty thousand livestock permittees whose livelihood is wholly or partially dependent upon livestock grazed on national-forest ranges; and

Whereas these lands contain over four million acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timberlands and an additional four million acres of seriously depleted range lands; and

Whereas all of these lands are potentially capable of producing an important part of the timber and forage needs of local communities, and contributing to the protection of water sheds, thereby alleviating flood damage and insuring a continuing water supply, increasing opportunity for local employment, bringing greater stability to local communities, and increasing returns to counties in the national forests from their share of national forests receipts, together with other benefits; and

Whereas these lands will not restock or revegetate satisfactorily or within a reasonable time except through reforestation and revegetation or other measures to induce restocking or revegetation; and

Whereas it is practical to reforest these denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked timber lands and revegetate these seriously depleted range lands in a period of fifteen years; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide reasonable continuity of reforestation and revegetation programs in order to insure effective, efficient, and economical operations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation and revegetation of national-forest lands

and other lands under administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits hereinbefore enumerated.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other lands under the administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation; and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for range revegetation.

Approved October 11, 1949.